

The Road to Inclusive Practices:
Report of the Mayor's Advisory Council
on Special Education

August 13, 2008

August 13, 2008

Dear Mayor Dean:

For the past six months, your advisory council of committed parents, students, educators, advocates, and other professionals has studied and listened to the community about how to best support students who are receiving special education services in Metro Nashville Public Schools.

The following report represents our analysis and recommendations in this important area. We met for the first time on Feb. 14, 2008 and since then have met ten times. We were committed to hearing from the entire community, so our meetings were held across Nashville in middle schools and community centers.

In addition to our regular meetings, we hosted three community forums to hear from students, parents, educators, and administrators about their experiences with the Metro Nashville Public Schools and its Special Education Department.

Our Council divided into three working groups: (1) Current Status of Metro Nashville Public Schools and Special Education Services; (2) Best Practices/Legal Mandates in Special Education; and (3) School, Family and Community Partnerships. Through these working groups, our Council members gathered important information about where we are today, and where we want to be in the future.

The message coming from our community – from students, from families, from educators, and from advocates – is strong and clear. We can no longer afford to be a district that does not provide the necessary supports and services for the success of ALL students. For too long, our students with disabilities have had too little and too late. And, with great resources in this city, we know we can do better. Ten years ago, another “special education improvement taskforce” made some of the same recommendations that are included in our report today. Yet, nothing changed district-wide. It is our hope that at this time the recommendations will be implemented at Metropolitan Nashville Public Schools. To achieve this goal will take commitment at all levels at MNPS, from the Director of Schools to the custodians, to the principle that every student is important and deserves the best our school system can offer. To put it simply, the Department of Special Education cannot do this alone; change toward inclusive practices will be a system change.

This report would not have been possible without the wonderful commitment of our Council and without the excellent support of Dr. Danielle Mezera, director of the Mayor’s Office of Children and Youth, and Katherine Ross, of her staff. Additionally, former MNPS Executive Director of Special Education Sharon Wright and current Executive Director Linda DePriest have been very helpful in supplying information requested by our group. MNPS staff also provided meeting places and logistical support for our Council.

But most importantly, we could not have done this work without your support to improve the lives of students with disabilities and their families. Thank you for your interest and your

commitment. We look forward to making Nashville one of the best systems and communities in the nation for students with disabilities and their families.

Sincerely,

Wendy Tucker

Elise McMillan

I. Mayor's Advisory Council Recommendations

- 1. Inclusive practices should be adopted comprehensively across MNPS. This will require the conversion of the current service delivery system to a model based on inclusive practices.** This conversion should be guided by a consultant and an appointed task force who can work together to meet the needs of all MNPS students. This task force should be comprised of parents, educators (general education and special education), and other appropriate stakeholders. One of the most critical aspects of a conversion plan will be the professional development component, which must be sufficiently comprehensive to ensure the effective implementation of inclusive practices.
- 2. Support of students receiving special education services must become a concern of leadership of the district, not the responsibility of just those in the special education department.** The leadership both at the Central Office and at the building level must be made accountable for the support or lack of support for students with disabilities.
- 3. Communication between educators, administrators and families must improve for positive change to occur within MNPS.** The Advisory Council supports changes that will improve the consistency, clarity, accessibility, and transparency of communications from administrators in the Central Office to administrators at the building level to the public and to educators.
- 4. Professional development and training must be appropriate, sufficiently comprehensive, and accessible for all MNPS personnel for the successful conversion of MNPS to an inclusive practices model.** The training of both general and special educators, as well as transportation and other support staff should be included.
- 5. All students must have access to the general curriculum. According to the MNPS Department of Special Education and the information gathered by the Advisory Council, access to the general curriculum is not available to some students with disabilities.** The Council advocates applying the concept of Universal Design and allocating the necessary resources so that all students have access to appropriate grade level instruction and materials. This concern is about more than resources and materials. At a very basic level, the general education curriculum is not being taught in some of Metro's self-contained classrooms. There must be a standard curriculum for all students and all classrooms.
- 6. Effective reading instruction must be available to all MNPS students. Accordingly, MNPS should continue to implement balanced literacy practices in elementary schools, and expand these practices into middle and high schools.** Correct implementation will require training all educators in balanced literacy and the use of assessment data to develop specific interventions for struggling readers. The district should employ research-based methodologies for teaching reading to ALL students including those with more significant disabilities.

- 7. Consistent disciplinary procedures that incorporate Positive Behavior Support (PBS) strategies should be adopted by MNPS.** The Advisory Council advocates for the willing adoption of PBS by leadership at the district level, so that all educators have access to a consistent, comprehensive, and effective strategy for working with all students—including those who present challenging behaviors.
- 8. Transition services should be developed immediately to ensure that all high school students are prepared to fully participate in the community with the appropriate supports after exiting MNPS.** Community-based classroom programs and all programs for students with disabilities going through transition should incorporate best practices, include appropriate employment goals, and focus on foundational job skills.
- 9. Data collection and data-based decision making should be implemented across MNPS. Although some schools and educators currently use data to inform practices, most will require professional development and training.** Further, MNPS should develop a comprehensive plan to ensure that appropriate data is collected and used to inform decisions to continuously address the needs of students receiving special education services.
- 10. Transportation to and from school should convert to an inclusive model, mirroring the efforts made in classrooms.** The Advisory Council recommends that MNPS leaders reduce the number of students placed on segregated school buses, without sacrificing safety, by ensuring appropriate supervision and supports are in place.

II. Overview of Inclusive Practices

The Mayor's Advisory Council on Special Education has assessed the strengths and weaknesses of existing programs and policies for students with special needs who are served by Metropolitan Nashville Public Schools (MNPS). While the Advisory Council has heard many success stories in this process, overwhelmingly, our findings have indicated the inconsistency and inadequacy of MNPS special education services.

By law, every MNPS student with a disability is entitled to a free, appropriate public education. While parents with sufficient education, time and resources often are successful in securing appropriate special education services, many parents of students with disabilities do not have the knowledge or skills to effectively advocate for their children. Consequently, many MNPS students with disabilities are not receiving appropriate services.

Consistent delivery of appropriate services will require support from leadership at all levels, including both central administration and building level administration. Furthermore, these changes must translate into a uniform availability of services so that, regardless of parents' education level, ethnicity, or socioeconomic status, each can work within MNPS to secure the appropriate services for their children.

Findings in the Area of Legal Mandates

Legal requirements related to special education are contained in federal and state statutory provisions, federal and state regulations, and interpretive case law. The federal statute governing special education is the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 ("IDEIA"). State rules governing special education programs and services can be found at Chapter 0520-1-9 of the Rules of the Tennessee State Board of Education.¹

Congress has delineated the following as one of the primary purposes of IDEIA: "To ensure that all children with disabilities have available to them a free appropriate public education that emphasizes special education and related services **designed to meet their unique needs and prepare them for further education, employment and independent living.**" 20 U.S.C. § 1400(d)(1)(A)(emphasis added). Thus, under IDEIA and state special education law, one of the most fundamental rights of students with disabilities is the right to a free, appropriate public education ("FAPE"). "Special education" is defined under federal law as "specially designed instruction, at no cost to parents, to meet the unique needs of a child with a disability, including (A) instruction conducted in the classroom, in the home, in hospitals and institutions, and in other settings; and (B) instruction in physical education." 20 U.S.C. § 1401(29).

¹ An overview of federal law relating to special education is provided as Appendix C. Because the primary focus of the Advisory Council's Report is the need for MNPS to move towards adopting inclusive practices, the legal overview provided in Appendix C similarly focuses on legal mandates related to Least Restrictive Environment. If requested, a more comprehensive legal overview can be supplied.

IDEIA requires that students with disabilities be educated in the least restrictive environment (“LRE”). Specifically, the federal regulations state that to the maximum extent appropriate, children with disabilities are to be educated with children who do not have disabilities, and that special classes, schools or other removal of children with disabilities from the regular education environment occurs only if the nature or severity of the disability is such that education in regular classes with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily. 34 C.F.R. 300.114

Findings in the Area of Inclusive Education

The Advisory Council spent considerable time discussing, researching and otherwise exploring inclusive education, and arrived at four primary findings with respect to this important topic. First, federal and state law unequivocally requires that students with disabilities be educated, to the maximum extent appropriate, with their peers without disabilities. Second, data provided by MNPS reveals that MNPS does not effectively utilize inclusive practices district-wide. Rather, the district currently operates on a more segregated delivery of services model under which many students are placed in self-contained classrooms, without access to peers without disabilities or the general education curriculum. Third, there is considerable concern among parents, teachers and other community members related to the lack of inclusive practices within MNPS. Finally, best practices with respect to educating students with disabilities require the utilization of inclusive practices. Each of these findings is discussed in more detail below.

A. Legal Requirements Related to Least Restrictive Environment

As stated above, and as more thoroughly discussed in Appendix C, federal and state law require that students with disabilities be educated in the least restrictive environment. Under Least Restrictive Environment requirements, students must be educated, to the maximum extent appropriate, in their neighborhood schools, and with their peers without disabilities. The presumed placement for every student, therefore, is in a general education classroom in the school that the student would attend if not disabled. A more restrictive placement (i.e., special classes, separate schooling or other removal from the general education classroom) may only be considered where education in regular classes with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily. Thus, before considering a more restrictive placement for a student, an Individualized Education Plan (IEP) team must consider the full range of supplementary aids and services that can be provided in the general education classroom.²

B. MNPS’ Current Delivery of Services Model

²Supplementary aids and services means “aids, services, and other supports that are provided in regular education classes, other education-related settings, and in extracurricular and nonacademic settings, to enable children with disabilities to be educated with children without disabilities to the maximum extent appropriate.” 34 C.F.R. 300.42. Supplementary aids and services include, but are not limited to, environmental/physical modifications, instructional modifications, social/behavioral interventions/supports, staff supports and collaboration, and testing accommodations. A list of examples of supplementary aids and services is attached as Appendix E.

MNPS currently operates on a segregated delivery of services model under which many students – particularly those with more significant disabilities – are placed in self-contained “special education” classrooms, without meaningful exposure to their peers without disabilities or to the general education curriculum. Rather than utilizing inclusive practices under which the district would strive to place all students in a general education classroom with appropriate supports and services, MNPS utilizes a programmatic approach to educating students with disabilities.

Under this approach, students with disabilities are assigned to one or more “special education programs”³ within the district, and typically have their special education services delivered in that segregated environment.⁴

Because of MNPS’ approach to educating students with disabilities, many of these students have little or no contact with the general education population or curriculum. MNPS data reveals that 31 percent of all students with disabilities spend less than 50 percent of their time in a general education setting. This number increases significantly within certain disability categories. For instance, 75 percent of students with mental retardation and nearly 70 percent of students with autism are in self-contained environments for at least 50 percent of each school day.

While the data shows that some students with significant disabilities spend some portion of the day in a general education setting, many MNPS students are completely segregated from the general education environment.⁵ Twenty-seven percent of students with mild mental retardation, 41 percent of students with moderate mental retardation, 32 percent of students with profound mental retardation, and 39 percent of students with severe mental retardation spend no time at all in a general education setting. Similarly, 31 percent of students with autism spend their entire school day in completely self-contained settings. Even within disability categories

³MNPS’ primary special education programs are Life Skills (designed primarily for students with cognitive disabilities), Communication-Based Intervention Program (“CBIP”) (designed primarily for students with communication disorders, including autism), Moderate Intervention Program – Conduct (designed for students with more significant behavioral issues), and Moderate Intervention Program – Fragile (designed for students with mental health care needs and/or significant internalizing behaviors). The district also has a Resource Program that is a pull-out program for students who require more intensive instruction outside of the general education classroom). MNPS also operates at least four separate schools for students with disabilities. These schools have no students without disabilities.

⁴Anecdotal evidence gathered by the Advisory Council suggests that placement decisions tend to be driven by a consideration of which self-contained “program” best fits a student. Special education advocates report that MNPS IEP teams frequently do not follow the process required by law under which placement in a general education classroom with supplementary aids and services is always considered prior to the consideration of a more restrictive placement. Particularly with respect to students with cognitive or more significant disabilities, IEP teams frequently propose a very restrictive placement first, thereby placing the burden of proposing and justifying a less restrictive placement on the parent, guardian or advocate. Many parents are unaware of their child’s right to be educated in the least restrictive environment, and therefore unknowingly consent to an overly restrictive placement.

⁵See Appendix F, which is a breakdown of the percentage of time that every student with a disability spends in special education versus general education. It should be noted that while the data contained in Appendix F is helpful in demonstrating the extent to which students are segregated from the general education environment, it is not possible to tell from this data whether the time described for a student as “general education” time is academic/instructional time, or other non-academic time during the day, such as lunch, recess, and special programming. A further breakdown of this data has been requested from MNPS.

typically considered to be less significant than mental retardation and autism, a surprising number of students are completely segregated from the general education environment.⁶

Further, when students with disabilities are included in general education classrooms, general education teachers often are not equipped to meet their educational needs. MNPS currently provides little or no professional development opportunities related to inclusion,⁷ significantly impairing the ability of MNPS general education teachers to effectively teach students with disabilities who may spend time in or be assigned to their classrooms. To the extent that students with more significant disabilities are included in general education classrooms, this lack of training for general education teachers leads to a high risk that many of these students will be marginalized and not meaningfully included in the learning environment within that classroom.

C. Concerns of Parents/Teachers/Community Members Regarding Least Restrictive Environment

During the three community forums sponsored by the Mayor's Advisory Council, the Council received many comments and concerns regarding inclusive practices. In fact, based on the sheer number of concerns (both written and verbal), it appears that inclusion is one of the top concerns of parents of students receiving special education services.

The Report of the School, Family, and Community Partnerships Subgroup (Appendix D) details the comments/concerns received from participants on all topics. Some of the responses to the question "What is your #1 concern regarding MNPS special education?" were:

- general education teachers need to be trained to educate and include special needs children in the general ed classroom for successful inclusion
- lack of inclusion practices in MNPS
- Inclusion – is it a top priority and will all principals be required to participate?
- Inclusion – prepare our students for the real world by integrating them (with supports) into the real world classroom
- MNPS is not organized for the "inclusion" model; Teachers & aides are not trained in inclusion and there is no parallel curriculum

Furthermore, the overwhelming response to the inclusion training sponsored by the Mayor's Advisory Council and the Mayor's Office of Children and Youth demonstrates the degree to which MNPS teachers are eager to become trained on inclusive practices. Of the 218 registrants

⁶The data provided in Appendix F reveals that the following percentages of students (by disability category) are completely segregated from the general education environment: Orthopedic/Physical Impairment (24%), Specific Learning Disability (5%), ADHD (16%), Functional Delay (13%), and Developmental Delay (18%).

⁷Based on information provided by MNPS, during the 2007-2008 school year only four professional development courses related to inclusive practices were made available to general education teachers. Of those, one focused on adapting special area classes (P.E., art, music) for students with autism, one dealt with promoting independence and positive behavior in the learning environment, and two focused on differentiated instruction.

in the training,⁸ which was held on June 9, 2008, 99 were MNPS teachers. Of those, 59 were general education teachers. A significant number of MNPS general education teachers contacted the Advisory Council to express regret that they were unable to attend the training and to request that additional training opportunities be offered.

D. Best Practices Regarding Inclusive Education

Some research regarding inclusive practices suggests that the benefits of inclusion across grade levels far outweigh the difficulties inclusion may present (Kochhar, West, and Taymans, 2000). In this study, the authors conclude that for students with disabilities, inclusion (1) facilitates more appropriate social behavior because of higher expectations in the general education classroom; (2) promotes levels of achievement higher or at least as high as those achieved in self-contained classrooms; (3) offers a wide circle of support, including social support from classmates without disabilities; and (4) improves the ability of students and teachers to adapt to different teaching and learning styles.

The authors further contend that general education students also benefit from inclusion. For these students, inclusion (1) offers the advantage of having an extra teacher or aide to help them with the development of their own skills; (2) leads to greater acceptance of students with disabilities; (3) facilitates understanding that students with disabilities are not always easily identified; and (4) promotes better understanding of the similarities among students with and without disabilities.⁹

Indeed, the experience of at least one Tennessee school district that recently converted its system of delivery of special education services from a segregated model to an inclusive model is consistent with the research-based findings set forth above. Between 2000 and 2003, under the direction of then Director of Student Support Services, Michael Remus, Williamson County changed the way in which it delivered services to students needing special education. During that three year period, the district moved these students to their neighborhood schools, eliminated segregated classes and cluster sites, and, most importantly, began teaching them the general curriculum. The district also set up Learning Centers in each building where students may go for individual or small group instruction specified in their IEPs.

While Williamson County's size and demographics differ substantially from those of Metro Nashville, it should be noted that other large, urban school districts also have begun to restructure the manner in which those districts deliver special education services. Both Seattle and San Diego, for instance, have hired outside consultants that have recommended the

⁸Because of the enormous interest in this workshop, the decision was made to open registration to non-MNPS personnel. Attendees included parents, advocates, private school teachers and principals, and teachers from as far as Memphis and Clarksville. However, the majority of participants were teachers, parents and advocates for MNPS students.

⁹Moreover, no research has definitively demonstrated that inclusive practices are more costly. Interestingly, one study found that the cost of educating students in segregated programs was double that of educating them in integrated programs (Pioma, M. F. (1989). *Benefits and Costs of Integrating Students with Severe Disabilities into Public School Programs: A Study Summary of Money Well Spent*. San Francisco: San Francisco State University).

utilization of more inclusive practices. Information regarding the outside reviews conducted for Seattle and San Diego can be found at the following websites:

Seattle – http://www.seattleschools.org/area/strategicplan/special_ed_summary.pdf

San Diego – http://www.sandi.net/depts/specialed/hehir_report_updates.asp

In short, the Advisory Council found that research supports the conclusion that inclusive practices are beneficial to all students, and that best practice with respect to students with disabilities requires a model that maximizes every student's opportunity to be educated in the general education classroom. Combined with federal and state legal mandates that students be educated in the least restrictive environment possible, it is imperative that MNPS becomes a district that employs inclusive practices.

Recommendation: Inclusive practices should be adopted comprehensively across MNPS. This will require the conversion of the current service delivery system to a model based on inclusive practices. This conversion should be guided by a consultant and an appointed task force who can work together to meet the needs of all MNPS students. This task force should be comprised of parents, educators (general education and special education), and other appropriate stakeholders. One of the most critical aspects of a conversion plan will be the professional development component, which must be sufficiently comprehensive to ensure the effective implementation of inclusive practices.

III. Recommendations Supported by Findings

1. Inclusive practices

Findings: Findings for this recommendation are outlined in Section II of the report.

Recommendation: Inclusive practices should be adopted comprehensively across MNPS. This will require the conversion of the current service delivery system to a model based on inclusive practices. This conversion should be guided by a consultant and an appointed task force who can work together to meet the needs of all MNPS students. This task force should be comprised of parents, educators (general education and special education), and other appropriate stakeholders. One of the most critical aspects of a conversion plan will be the professional development component, which must be sufficiently comprehensive to ensure the effective implementation of inclusive practices.

2. Support from MNPS leadership

Findings: During the meetings and public hearings of the Advisory Council, we heard from families and educators that students receiving special education services are not supported by leadership of MNPS and leadership in schools. Too often, special education staff was not supported by principals and general educators.

Recommendation: Support of students receiving special education services must become a concern of leadership of the district, not the responsibility of just those in the special education department. The leadership both at the Central Office and at the building level must be made accountable for the support or lack of support for students with disabilities. In the past, the district has planned for programs within certain clusters or areas, for improving services for students with disabilities. We are recommending a district-wide change, and know that without the support of top leadership of the district, that change cannot happen.

3. Communication

Findings: In addition to inclusive practices and support from district leadership and principals, issues that can be grouped under the umbrella category of “communication” were among the most commonly mentioned concerns in the Advisory Council meetings, our three Community Forums, the Mayor’s Town Hall Meeting on Special Education, and e-mails received through the website.

Ineffective communication has been reported at all levels, and by all parties involved in special education, including communication between:

- parents and educators regarding services for students
- school administration and families regarding available programs and other resources
- school administration and educators regarding the allocation of resources
- school administration, educators, and paraprofessionals regarding professional development opportunities

- school administration, educators, paraprofessionals, families, and other involved community members (such as professionals in the medical community)

On the MNPS Website:

- The special education information is difficult to find, being located only as a link under the "Teaching & Learning" tab across the top.
- Special education appears as an isolated department and is not integrated with MNPS.
- The information currently provided is limited, dated, and difficult to navigate.

Recommendation: Communication between educators, administrators, and families must improve for positive change to occur within MNPS. The Advisory Council supports changes that will improve the consistency, clarity, accessibility and transparency of communications from administrators in the Central Office to administrators at the building level, to the public, and to educators.

Further, the Council advocates training and mentoring of educators and families to foster better communication on behalf of students receiving special education services.

The Advisory Council recognizes first that MNPS must diversify the modality of its communication to families and the greater community, in order to reach those who do not have access to messages sent electronically. Furthermore, efforts should be made to minimize all other barriers to communication by diversifying the mode and language used to communicate information. In our culturally and linguistically diverse community, MNPS cannot afford to disregard the accommodations that can be made to communicate with all members of the Nashville community. Translations of both written and verbal communication should be readily available for any family that requires this accommodation.

On the MNPS website, information on special education should be easier to access and find, with some type of link on the MNPS home page.

- The Department of Special Education home page should communicate more clearly:
 - the philosophy of MNPS special education;
 - how to access special education services; and
 - whom to contact with questions and concerns.
- The information page/links should be kept to a reasonably small list, but the links should have a brief explanation as to the content and purpose of the link. A phone number should also be provided to promote ease of communication.
- Linkage to the Department of Special Education home page should be provided under all of the tabs on the MNPS site; also links should connect it to pertinent areas and subjects such as early childhood/Pre-K, graduation, community education, etc.
- The site should be consistently updated so that all information is timely and accurate.
- Frequently asked questions should be addressed.
- Links to resources outside of MNPS such as Metro Public Health, the Tennessee Department of Children's Services, Tennessee Early Intervention System, and the Tennessee Disability Pathfinder should be included.

4. Professional development and training

Findings: The Advisory Council held its meetings in middle schools across the district. At each location, we met with the school principal to hear about supports and services for students with disabilities. We asked each principal the most pressing need in special education; their unanimous answer was the need for more training.

Training also was a top concern at the public forums sponsored by the Advisory Council. Particularly, community members were concerned that the training currently available does not help prepare educators for their task in the classroom. Subgroups also had concerns specific to their roles within the system. For example, concern was expressed over the absence or inadequacy of training available to paraprofessionals. Parents voiced the need for training about their children's legal rights, and decried the absence of any mentoring programs that could help them navigate the complexities of special education services.

Educators also voiced many concerns related to this critical topic. First, general education teachers reported that they have not been trained appropriately to teach students with disabilities, even though these students have been placed in their classes. Second, educators were concerned over the poor communication of training opportunities. Finally, educators were very concerned over the accessibility of trainings, given their current time commitments.

The overwhelming response to the inclusion training sponsored by the Mayor's Advisory Council and the Mayor's Office of Children and Youth on June 9, 2008 demonstrates the degree to which MNPS educators are eager to receive training on inclusive practices. Of the 218 registrants in the training,¹⁰ 99 were Metro educators. Of those, 59 were general education teachers. A significant number of MNPS general education educators contacted the Advisory Council to express regret that they were unable to attend the training and to request that additional training opportunities be offered.

Clearly, training for all MNPS educators is needed. Professional development must be differentiated for both the position and the employee. One size does not fit all, and the needs of the veteran educator are different from those of the novice. Professional development needs to be comprehensive, recurrent, and tied to scientifically-based practices. Targeted professional development on the least restrictive environment must be provided. Currently, there is very limited training time, and it is not always aligned with goals of an inclusive school district. According to a presentation on inclusive practices made by Michael Remus, Director of Special Education for Deer Valley Schools in Arizona, it takes from three to five years to change the culture of a school district. Strategic training and professional development are critical in this area.

Further, MNPS currently provides too few professional development opportunities related to inclusion,¹¹ significantly impairing the ability of MNPS general educators to effectively teach students with disabilities who may be assigned to their classrooms. To the extent that students with more significant disabilities are included in general education classrooms, this lack of training for general education educators leads to a high risk that many of these students will be marginalized, and not meaningfully included in that classroom.

Recommendation: Professional development and training must be appropriate, sufficiently comprehensive, and accessible for all MNPS personnel for the successful conversion of MNPS to an inclusive practices model. The training of both general and special educators, as well as transportation and other support staff should be included.

To that end, an overall training and professional development plan should be developed so that all personnel receive training on providing services and supports for students with disabilities. This plan should provide focused staff development to all educators to support inclusive practices and align services with federal and state law. Conversion to an inclusive delivery system makes this training requisite; it should not be optional for anyone working in MNPS. An important component of this training should include strategies to develop successful partnerships with families and the community in order to support students receiving special education services.

Finally, training should be offered in a way that maximizes the efficient use of MNPS educators' time. Training should be incorporated into the hours for which MNPS personnel are compensated, and should be offered at times that personnel can attend.

5. Access to the general curriculum

Findings: Across the district, we heard from parents of students who do not have access to the same textbooks and materials as other students in general education classrooms. Additionally, we heard from students in Life Skills classes without textbooks. Students with disabilities need access to the curriculum just like other students. Access to the general curriculum currently is not available to some students with disabilities, according to the MNPS Department of Special Education and information gathered by the Advisory Council.

Recommendation: All students must have access to the general curriculum. According to the MNPS Department of Special Education and the information gathered by the Advisory Council, access to the general curriculum is not available to some students with disabilities. The Council advocates applying the concept of Universal Design and allocating the necessary resources so that all students have access to appropriate grade level instruction and materials. This concern is about more than resources and materials. At a very basic level, the general education curriculum is not being taught in MNPS self-contained classrooms. There must be a standard curriculum for all students and all classrooms.

¹¹Based on information provided by MNPS, during the 2007-2008 school year, only four professional development courses related to inclusive practices were made available to general education educators. Of those, one focused on adapting Special area classes (P.E., art, music) for students with autism, one dealt with promoting independence and positive behavior in the learning environment, and two focused on differentiated instruction.

Using the concept of Universal Design, materials can be made accessible to all students. National organizations such as the Center for Applied Special Technology (CAST) in Peabody, Massachusetts, offer training and technical assistance for school districts. CAST's solution, called Universal Design for Learning (UDL), provides a blueprint for creating flexible goals, methods, materials, and assessments that accommodate the unique needs of students.

“‘Universal’ does not imply a single optimal solution for everyone. Instead, it is meant to underscore the need for multiple approaches to meet the needs of diverse learners. UDL mirrors the universal design movement in architecture and product development. Think of speakerphones, curb cuts, and close-captioned television—all universally designed to accommodate a wide variety of users, including those with disabilities. Embedded features that help those with disabilities eventually benefit everyone. UDL uses technology's power and flexibility to make education more inclusive and effective for all.”

6. Reading instruction

Findings: No Child Left Behind mandates that all children read at a proficient level by the end of third grade; it also requires schools to use research-based instructional practices. This legislation utilized the National Reading Panel Report (2000) which contained a review of more than 100,000 research studies pertaining to reading instruction and extensive recommendations regarding best practices for all students. The NRP identified five critical areas of reading instruction: phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and text comprehension.

The report provides extensive information on how to effectively address each of these critical areas in a comprehensive classroom literacy program. Although the report does not specifically address students with disabilities, research studies focused on students with dyslexia have shown best practices to be virtually the same for that population as those contained in the NRP research.

A critical key to providing effective reading instruction for all students, but particularly important for students with disabilities, is ongoing formative assessment. The results of assessments should be used to drive the instructional program for the individual student, intervening in the areas of weakness and utilizing strengths to compensate. Interventions should be systematic, multi-sensory, and specific to the learning style of the student. Although effective intervention in specific deficit areas is critical to student progress, it is imperative that the child experience a comprehensive literacy program that is rich in vocabulary, meaning, and context.

In the last five years, MNPS implemented these research-based practices in the elementary schools. In kindergarten through fourth grade, the classroom literacy block addresses each of the five critical areas of reading instruction. General education classroom teachers have undergone extensive training to implement a balanced literacy program in their classrooms and are required to formally assess their students three times a year, and to informally assess them on a weekly basis. As a result, students in elementary schools are reading at higher levels than in prior years and fewer students require special education services to address reading deficiencies. The balanced literacy initiative has more recently been phased into the middle schools, and has not had time yet to demonstrate its success.

Special education teachers who provide reading instruction have not had as much training in the balanced literacy approach as their colleagues who teach in general education classrooms. Although the district trainings are open to special education teachers, the priority has been improving the general education literacy program. Additionally, given the demands already placed on special education teachers due to class size, these educators have not been uniformly trained in these best practices. As a result, considerable variability in reading instruction exists for students with disabilities in MNPS.

Recommendation: Effective reading instruction must be available to all MNPS students. Accordingly, MNPS should continue to implement balanced literacy practices in elementary schools, and expand these practices into middle and high schools. Correct implementation will require training all educators in balanced literacy and the use of assessment data to develop specific interventions for struggling readers.

The Council further recommends that steps are taken to ensure that a comprehensive literacy program and systematic intervention are being provided to students receiving special education by increasing collaboration among reading specialists, general education teachers and special education teachers to ensure that students receive instruction in each of the critical areas.

7. Consistent disciplinary procedures

Findings: The Advisory Council is very concerned about the consistency of disciplinary procedures across MNPS. First, MNPS has not adopted a district-wide plan to address disciplinary concerns. In the absence of such a plan, disciplinary procedures vary according to the leadership at particular schools. This becomes problematic when students move from one school to another. It also allows for an unfair application of disciplinary policies that may affect one population of students more than others. For example, African American males are overrepresented among students with disabilities who have been disciplined at school. Also, students with behavior problems are being excluded inappropriately at times because school staff has not been equipped appropriately to manage their behavior within a general education classroom.

To address such these problems, and to standardize disciplinary procedures such that we avoid future disparities, the Advisory Council suggests the adoption of Positive Behavior Support (PBS) strategies.

Technical assistance can be provided at the district, school, small group, or individual level to ensure that all students have access to appropriate education in the least restrictive environment. This would include behavior assessments, skills instruction, group intervention, progress monitoring, and on-going evaluation.

Recommendation: Consistent disciplinary procedures that incorporate Positive Behavior Support (PBS) strategies should be adopted by MNPS. The Advisory Council advocates for the willing adoption of PBS by leadership at the district level, so that all educators have access to a consistent, comprehensive, and effective strategy working with all students—including those who present challenging behaviors.

8. Transition from School to Community

Findings: Students with disabilities have legal rights to transition services, as outlined in IDEIA and the Vocational Rehabilitation Act. Students qualified for special education services must have an Individualized Transition Plan (ITP) created by the school starting at age 14. If the ITP includes additional employment training or employment outcomes, Vocational Rehabilitation (VR) should be involved in the process as early as possible, but no later than 12-18 months before exiting MNPS.

A student may be eligible if he/she has a physical or mental impairment that makes it difficult to find or keep a job. VR has designated counselors who would work directly with eligible MNPS students as they prepare to exit the school system. A complete listing of services and programs is available at: www.tennessee.gov/humanserv/rehab/vrs.htm.

Davidson County is fortunate to have an excellent example of a transition program currently in Project Opportunity. Modeled after Project SEARCH, at Cincinnati Children's Hospital, this program is an example of best practices available to MNPS students. Project Opportunity works in conjunction with the Vanderbilt University Medical Center (VUMC) to provide instruction and support to young adults with severe disabilities who are transitioning from high school to the workplace.

The program consists of two distinct, yet overlapping components: a job-readiness training program in integrated settings, and career advancement services for Project Opportunity graduates who qualify for competitive employment. The program provides its student-interns with individualized, on-site work experiences, as well as the tools to make realistic career choices.

Project Opportunity differs from existing MNPS transition programs in that the goal is employment; follow-along services are in place to facilitate careers, not just placement. During Project Opportunity's three-year existence, the program has served 19 student-interns with severe disabilities; 13 are currently working in full- or part-time existing positions at Vanderbilt University and VUMC.

The Project Opportunity model depends on a highly qualified and dedicated staff, ongoing training and support to employers, and consistent follow-along services. The placement and retention rates of this program illustrate its success, but the true measure can be seen in the self-esteem, independence and individual achievements of the participants. This program model should be replicated so that similar components could be available to all qualified students in MNPS.

Recommendation: Transition services should be developed immediately to ensure that all high school students are prepared to fully participate in the community with the appropriate supports after exiting MNPS. Community-based classroom programs and all programs for students with disabilities going through transition should incorporate best practices, include appropriate employment goals, and focus on foundational job skills.

The Advisory Council recommends that the Project Opportunity model is utilized in the existing community-based classrooms. Transition services should be prioritized to ensure that all high school students are prepared to fully participate in the community with the appropriate supports after exiting MNPS. Both Community-based classrooms and Life Skills programs should incorporate best practices, include appropriate employment goals, and focus on foundational job skills. Finally, the Advisory Council supports the increased collaboration between MNPS and VR staff.

9. Data collection and data-based decision making

Findings: By its very nature, special education services involve much documentation of student progress in forms and reports. The Advisory Council has found that, often, this data is not being proactively used to drive decisions made on behalf of MNPS students receiving special education services. Often, data is not used effectively because students move from one school to another, an artifact of the reality that unsatisfied parents pursue better services by relocating their children. Further, many educators have a wealth of data which could be used to more effectively match services to students' needs; unfortunately, too often, educators do not take full advantage of this critical information because they are not trained to do so, they do not have adequate time, or some combination of the two.

Currently a random sample of MNPS parents are surveyed as part of the monitoring process conducted by the State Department of Education, Division of Special Education, which is a good beginning. However, data-based decision making should not be restricted to the state or administrative level. Rather, it should be valued and incorporated at the classroom level. Educators need better access to assessment data and more training in using data to guide instruction.

Recommendation: Data collection and data-based decision making should be implemented across MNPS. Although some schools and educators currently use data to inform practices, most will require professional development and training. Further, MNPS should develop a comprehensive plan to ensure that appropriate data is collected and used to inform decisions to continuously address the needs of students receiving special education services.

This same recommendation was made by the Mayor's Project for Student Success which presented recommendations to the Mayor to develop ways to reduce the number of students dropping out of MNPS. It is critically important that data be used to guide the development of policy and practice.

10. School transportation

Findings: Currently, limitations within the transportation system prevent some students from receiving the appropriate services. Under a more inclusive service delivery model, services would be more consistently available, and the number of special education buses potentially would be decreased. The reasons for this are two-fold. First, if students attend their school of zone, rather than cluster sites or special schools, fewer students will need special transportation. Second, under a more inclusive model, many students who currently are assigned to segregated

special education buses would be placed on inclusive general education school buses with supplementary aids and services.

Recommendation: Transportation to and from school should convert to an inclusive model, mirroring the efforts made in classrooms. The Advisory Council recommends that MNPS leaders reduce the number of students placed on segregated school buses, without sacrificing safety by ensuring appropriate supervision and supports are in place.

IV. Next Steps

For the Mayor and MNPS

The Mayor and MNPS leadership should hire a consultant to guide the conversion of MNPS to a district that adopts the comprehensive use of inclusive practices. The consultant should work with an appointed task force to meet the needs of all MNPS students. This task force should be comprised of parents, educators (general education and special education), and other appropriate stakeholders. One of the most critical aspects of a conversion plan will be the professional development component, which must be sufficiently comprehensive to ensure the effective implementation of inclusive practices.

For the Mayor and the Advisory Council on Special Education

There are several key areas that need to be addressed by the Mayor's Advisory Council on Special Education. First, one of the areas of greatest concern is the access by students with disabilities to the general curriculum. This is highlighted by the State's findings of lack of adequate yearly progress in this area.

Second, although the Advisory Council made an intentional effort to hold its Community Forums in various and diverse areas of Nashville, our efforts did not reach all populations of students and families served by MNPS. Future efforts should strive to include these groups and account for their perspective in improving the services available to students with disabilities in MNPS. This is especially critical because historically, underrepresented groups are disproportionately recipients of special education services, and further disproportionately recipients of disciplinary actions.

Advisory Council members have developed a community survey about special education services and supports in MNPS, included as Appendix B. The survey will be conducted through Aug. 31, 2008, and results will be reported to the Mayor by the end of October.

The Advisory Council has not yet had the opportunity to consider the adequacy of Aftercare and summer program offerings for students with disabilities.¹² This is a topic worthy of further research and consideration, as anecdotal evidence suggests that students with disabilities are underserved in aftercare and summer programs. The Council should research the availability of Aftercare programs and summer school options for students with disabilities, and whether the existing programs are sufficient to meet the needs of students with disabilities.

¹² Federal law provides that "[e]ach public agency must take steps, including the provision of supplementary aids and services determined appropriate and necessary by the child's IEP team, to provide nonacademic and extracurricular services and activities in the manner necessary to afford children with disabilities an equal opportunity for participation in those services and activities." 34 C.F.R. 300.107(a).

Appendix A. Mayor's Advisory Council on Special Education Members

Deidra Adamczyk - 332-0217 ext. 405
deidra.adamczyk@mnps.org
Croft Md. School
482 Elysian Fields
Nashville, TN 37211

Debbie L. Brown - 332-3020 ext. 300 (w) or 440-3260 (c)
debbie.brown@mnps.org
6015 Robert E. Lee Drive
Nashville 37215

Deana Claiborne - 242-4091
deana_claiborne@ucpnashville.org
1200 9th Ave. N.
Suite 110
Nashville, TN 37208

Andrea Cooper - 313-4714
andrea.cooper@state.tn.us
400 Dederick St.
15th Floor
Nashville, TN 37243

Linda DePriest
linda.depriest@mnps.org
Executive Director of Special Education
Metro Nashville Public Schools

Sara Ezell - 343-7773
sara.s.ezell@vanderbilt.edu
3415 West End Ave #804
Nashville, TN 37203

Blanche Jackson Glimps – 963-1346
bglimps@tnstate.edu
211 D Clay Hall, TSU,
3500 John Merritt Blvd.
Nashville, TN. 37209

Megan Griffin
megan.m.griffin@vanderbilt.edu
Vanderbilt Graduate Student

Elise McMillan - 343-2540 (w)
elise.mcmillan@Vanderbilt.Edu
Vanderbilt Kennedy Center
for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities
Peabody Box 40
230 Appleton Place
Nashville, TN 37203

Sheila Moore - 386-9002
dsamt@bellsouth.net
111 North Wilson Blvd.
Nashville, TN 37205

Arie L. Nettles – 936-0287 (w) or 582-8516 (c)
arie.l.nettles@Vanderbilt.Edu
Monroe Carell Jr. Children's Hospital at Vanderbilt
3401 West End Avenue Suite 460 West
Nashville TN 37232

Amanda Peltz - 385-2077
amanda@tnautism.org
955 Woodland St.
Nashville, TN 37206

Wendy Poston - 429-5780
wendy@wpln.org
2021 Benjamin St.
Nashville, TN 37206

Erin Richardson - 297-8673
erichardson@arcadc.org
709 Cantrell Ave.
Nashville, TN 37215

Tyler Samuel
cathlyn.samuel@state.tn.us (Mom's Email)
615-259-2191

Wendy Tucker - 579-3307 (c) or 269-4079 (h)
tuckerwing@gmail.com
304 Page Road
Nashville, TN 37205

Mark Wolery - 512-8934
mark.wolery@vanderbilt.edu
Box 228

Department of Special Education
Peabody College
Vanderbilt University
Nashville, TN 37203

Allyson Young - 578-1957 291-6040
allysonyoung@youngmotivationgroup.com
315 10th Ave. N.
Suite 119
Nashville, TN 37203

Mayor's Office – Contact

Danielle Mezera – 862-6013
danielle.mezera@nashville.gov
Mayor's Office
City Hall
Nashville, TN 37201

Appendix B. Community Survey

Special Education Survey

Instructions

Answer questions as they relate to you. For most answers, check the boxes most applicable to you or fill in the blanks.

Introduction

Need introduction to survey.

1. I understand that participation in this survey is anonymous and completely voluntary. This means that may skip any question(s) or exit the survey at any point without submitting my responses.

(Select only one.)

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No (End of survey)

Main

2. Participant is (check only one)

(Select only one.)

- ☐ Community Member
- ☐ General Education Teacher
- ☐ Parent or Guardian of Pre-school student
- ☐ Parent or Guardian of Elementary student
- ☐ Parent or Guardian of Middle School student
- ☐ Parent or Guardian of High School/Community Classroom student
- ☐ Related Services Personnel
- ☐ Special Education Teacher
- ☐ Student with a disability
- ☐ Student without a disability
- ☐ School Administrator
- ☐ Education Assistant

☐ Other:

3. Zip Code

(Provide one response only.)

Multiple Choice

4. MNPS provides quality programs, supports and services for students receiving special education services.

(Select only one.)

- ☐ 1. Agree
- ☐ 2. Somewhat Agree
- ☐ 3. Neutral
- ☐ 4. Somewhat Disagree
- ☐ 5. Disagree
- ☐ 6. Don't Know

5. MNPS encourages parental, family and community involvement as a means of improving services and results for students with disabilities.

(Select only one.)

- ☐ 1. Agree
- ☐ 2. Somewhat Agree
- ☐ 3. Neutral
- ☐ 4. Somewhat Disagree
- ☐ 5. Disagree
- ☐ 6. Don't Know

6. In MNPS, teachers and administrators ensure that families and students fully understand the procedural safeguards (rules in federal law that protect the rights of students and parents.)

(Select only one.)

- ☐ 1. Agree
- ☐ 2. Somewhat Agree
- ☐ 3. Neutral

- ☐ 4. Somewhat Disagree
- ☐ 5. Disagree
- ☐ 6. Don't Know

7. The school explains what options families have if they disagree with a decision of the school.

(Select only one.)

- ☐ 1. Agree
- ☐ 2. Somewhat Agree
- ☐ 3. Neutral
- ☐ 4. Somewhat Disagree
- ☐ 5. Disagree
- ☐ 6. Don't Know

8. The school communicates regularly with parents and families regarding the progress of students with disabilities.

(Select only one.)

- ☐ 1. Agree
- ☐ 2. Somewhat Agree
- ☐ 3. Neutral
- ☐ 4. Somewhat Disagree
- ☐ 5. Disagree
- ☐ 6. Don't Know

9. MNPS offers effective training for families about special education issues.

(Select only one.)

- ☐ 1. Agree
- ☐ 2. Somewhat Agree
- ☐ 3. Neutral
- ☐ 4. Somewhat Disagree
- ☐ 5. Disagree

- ☐ 6. Don't Know

10. MNPS offers effective training for educators about special education issues

(Select only one.)

- ☐ 1. Agree
- ☐ 2. Somewhat Agree
- ☐ 3. Neutral
- ☐ 4. Somewhat Disagree
- ☐ 5. Disagree
- ☐ 6. Don't Know

11. MNPS offers information on community agencies that can assist students in the transition from school to community.

(Select only one.)

- ☐ 1. Agree
- ☐ 2. Somewhat Agree
- ☐ 3. Neutral
- ☐ 4. Somewhat Disagree
- ☐ 5. Disagree
- ☐ 6. Don't Know

12. Special education teachers in MNPS have the training, supports and resources to make accommodations and modifications necessary.

(Select only one.)

- ☐ 1. Agree
- ☐ 2. Somewhat Agree
- ☐ 3. Neutral
- ☐ 4. Somewhat Disagree
- ☐ 5. Disagree
- ☐ 6. Don't Know

13. MNPS makes it possible for students receiving special education services to be taught in general education classes, with supports, to the maximum extent appropriate.

(Select only one.)

- ☐ 1. Agree
- ☐ 2. Somewhat Agree
- ☐ 3. Neutral
- ☐ 4. Somewhat Disagree
- ☐ 5. Disagree
- ☐ 6. Don't Know

14. General education teachers in MNPS have the training, supports and resources to make accommodations and modifications necessary

(Select only one.)

- ☐ 1. Agree
- ☐ 2. Somewhat Agree
- ☐ 3. Neutral
- ☐ 4. Somewhat Disagree
- ☐ 5. Disagree
- ☐ 6. Don't Know

15. MNPS principals do everything possible to support appropriate special education services in MNPS Schools.

(Select only one.)

- ☐ 1. Agree
- ☐ 2. Somewhat Agree
- ☐ 3. Neutral
- ☐ 4. Somewhat Disagree
- ☐ 5. Disagree
- ☐ 6. Don't Know

Multiple Choice 2

16. MNPS provides students with all the services documented in their Individualized Educational Plans.

(Select only one.)

- ☐ 1. Agree
- ☐ 2. Somewhat Agree
- ☐ 3. Neutral
- ☐ 4. Somewhat Disagree
- ☐ 5. Disagree
- ☐ 6. Don't Know

17. MNPS offers students without disabilities and their families opportunities to learn about students with disabilities.

(Select only one.)

- ☐ 1. Agree
- ☐ 2. Somewhat Agree
- ☐ 3. Neutral
- ☐ 4. Somewhat Disagree
- ☐ 5. Disagree
- ☐ 6. Don't Know

18. MNPS ensures that after-school and extracurricular activities are accessible to students with disabilities

(Select only one.)

- ☐ 1. Agree
- ☐ 2. Somewhat Agree
- ☐ 3. Neutral
- ☐ 4. Somewhat Disagree
- ☐ 5. Disagree
- ☐ 6. Don't Know

19. In MNPS, teachers and administrators provide culturally responsive programs and services to students.

(Select only one.)

- ☐ 1. Agree
- ☐ 2. Somewhat Agree
- ☐ 3. Neutral
- ☐ 4. Somewhat Disagree
- ☐ 5. Disagree
- ☐ 6. Don't Know

20. MNPS offers training to teachers and administrators to understand how culture impacts learning.

(Select only one.)

- ☐ 1. Agree
- ☐ 2. Somewhat Agree
- ☐ 3. Neutral
- ☐ 4. Somewhat Disagree
- ☐ 5. Disagree
- ☐ 6. Don't Know

21. In MNPS, cultural background of students does not influence disciplinary action

(Select only one.)

- ☐ 1. Agree
- ☐ 2. Somewhat Agree
- ☐ 3. Neutral
- ☐ 4. Somewhat Disagree
- ☐ 5. Disagree
- ☐ 6. Don't Know

22. MNPS schools, grounds, activities and services are physically accessible to students with mobility related disabilities.

(Select only one.)

- ☐ 1. Agree
- ☐ 2. Somewhat Agree
- ☐ 3. Neutral
- ☐ 4. Somewhat Disagree
- ☐ 5. Disagree
- ☐ 6. Don't Know

23. In MNPS, there is a system-wide understanding and proactive commitment to the process of inclusion.

(Select only one.)

- ☐ 1. Agree
- ☐ 2. Somewhat Agree
- ☐ 3. Neutral
- ☐ 4. Somewhat Disagree
- ☐ 5. Disagree
- ☐ 6. Don't Know

24. In MNPS, students are safe from bodily injury, bullying, sexual harassment, and other forms of harassment while participating in MNPS activities, both on and off school grounds.

(Select only one.)

- ☐ 1. Agree
- ☐ 2. Somewhat Agree
- ☐ 3. Neutral
- ☐ 4. Somewhat Disagree
- ☐ 5. Disagree
- ☐ 6. Don't Know

25. In MNPS, disciplinary actions are applied in a manner consistent with the most appropriate methods of correcting students with specific types of disabilities.

(Select only one.)

- ☐ 1. Agree
- ☐ 2. Somewhat Agree
- ☐ 3. Neutral
- ☐ 4. Somewhat Disagree
- ☐ 5. Disagree
- ☐ 6. Don't Know

26. MNPS students with needs for adaptive equipment and technology have access to the most appropriate devices and tools to meet their specific educational needs.

(Select only one.)

- ☐ 1. Agree
- ☐ 2. Somewhat Agree
- ☐ 3. Neutral
- ☐ 4. Somewhat Disagree
- ☐ 5. Disagree
- ☐ 6. Don't Know

27. Students with fragile health needs have access to appropriate health-related supports and services throughout MNPS.

(Select only one.)

- ☐ 1. Agree
- ☐ 2. Somewhat Agree
- ☐ 3. Neutral
- ☐ 4. Somewhat Disagree
- ☐ 5. Disagree
- ☐ 6. Don't Know

28. Students with behavioral health needs have access to appropriate mental-health related supports and services throughout MNPS.

(Select only one.)

- ☐ 1. Agree
- ☐ 2. Somewhat Agree
- ☐ 3. Neutral
- ☐ 4. Somewhat Disagree
- ☐ 5. Disagree
- ☐ 6. Don't Know

29. MNPS students with needs for resource services, personal assistance or supports, or specialized tutors have access to appropriate personnel to provide these services

(Select only one.)

- ☐ 1. Agree
- ☐ 2. Somewhat Agree
- ☐ 3. Neutral
- ☐ 4. Somewhat Disagree
- ☐ 5. Disagree
- ☐ 6. Don't Know

Comments

30. Do you have comments on any of the preceding questions? Enter as many comments as you need.

(Provide one response only.)

End

31. I am finished with the survey

(Select only one.)

- ☐ Yes

Appendix C. Legal Report¹³

I. Statutory Provisions

A. Findings/Purposes

1. Congressional Findings Related to LRE

a. 20 U.S.C. § 1400(c)(1)

Disability is a natural part of the human experience and in no way diminishes the right of individuals to participate in or contribute to society. Improving educational results for children with disabilities is an essential element of our national policy of ensuring equality of opportunity, full participation, independent living, and economic self-sufficiency for individuals with disabilities. (emphasis supplied)

b. 20 U.S.C. § 1400(c)(2)

Before the date of enactment of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 (Public Law 94-142), the educational needs of millions of children with disabilities were not being fully met because (A) the children did not receive appropriate educational services; (B) the children were excluded entirely from the public school system and from being educated with their peers; (C) undiagnosed disabilities prevented the children from having a successful educational experience; or (D) a lack of adequate resources within the public school system forced families to find services outside the public school system.

c. 20 U.S.C. § 1400(c)(3)

Since the enactment and implementation of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, this title has been successful in ensuring children with disabilities and the families of such children access to a free appropriate public education and in improving educational results for children with disabilities.

d. 20 U.S.C. § 1400 (c)(4)

However, the implementation of this title has been impeded by low expectations, and an insufficient focus on applying replicable

¹³ Contributors to Appendix C include Meghan Burke, Ph.D. candidate at Vanderbilt University, Wendy Tucker, co-chair of The Mayor's Advisory Council on Special Education, Sherry Wilds, Staff Attorney with Disability Law and Advocacy Center, and Erin Richardson, Director of Legal Advocacy at The Arc of Davidson County.

research on proven methods of teaching and learning for children with disabilities. (emphasis supplied)

e. 20 U.S.C. § 1400 (c)(5)

Almost 30 years of research and experience has demonstrated that the education of children with disabilities can be made more effective by (A) having high expectations for such children and ensuring their access to the general education curriculum in the regular classroom, to the maximum extent possible, in order to (i) meet developmental goals and, to the maximum extent possible, the challenging expectations that have been established for all children; and (ii) be prepared to lead productive and independent adult lives, to the maximum extent possible. (emphasis supplied)

2. Purposes of IDEIA – 20 U.S.C. § 1400(d)(1)(A)

The purposes of this title are - (1)(A) to ensure that all children with disabilities have available to them a free appropriate public education that emphasizes special education and related services designed to meet their unique needs and prepare them for further education, employment and independent living.

B. Regulatory Requirements Related to LRE

1. 34 C.F.R. 300.114 General LRE Requirements

Each public agency shall ensure

-that to the maximum extent appropriate, children with disabilities, including children in public or private institutions or other care facilities, are educated with children who are nondisabled; and
-that special classes, separate schooling or other removal of children with disabilities from the regular educational environment occurs only if the nature or severity of the disability is such that education in regular classes with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily.

2. 34 C.F.R. 300.115 Continuum of alternative placements

Each public agency shall ensure that a continuum of alternative placements is available to meet the needs of children with disabilities for special education and related services.

The continuum required in paragraph (a) of this section must

- include the alternative placements listed in the definition of special education under 300.26 (instruction in regular classes, special classes, special schools, home instruction, and instruction in hospitals and institutions); and
- make provision for supplementary services (such as resource room or itinerant instruction) to be provided in conjunction with regular class placement.

3. 34 C.F.R. 300.116 Placements

In determining the educational placement of a child with a disability, including a preschool child with a disability, each public agency shall ensure that

The placement decision

- is made by a group of persons, including the parents, and other persons knowledgeable about the child, the meaning of the evaluation data, and the placement options; and
- is made in conformity with the LRE provisions of this subpart, including 00.114-300.118.

The child's placement

- is determined at least annually
- is based on the child's IEP and
- is as close as possible to the child's home

Unless the IEP of a child with a disability requires some other arrangement, the child is educated in the school that he or she would attend if nondisabled;

In selecting LRE, consideration is given to any potential harmful effect on the child or on the quality of services that he or she needs; and

A child with a disability is not removed from education in age appropriate regular classrooms solely because of needed modifications in the general curriculum.

4. 34 C.F.R. 300.117 Nonacademic Settings

In providing or arranging for the provision of nonacademic and extracurricular services and activities, including meals, recess periods, and the services and activities set forth in 300.306, each public agency shall ensure that each child with a disability participates with nondisabled children in those services and activities to the maximum extent appropriate to the needs of that child.

5. 34 C.F.R. 300.107 Nonacademic services

Each school system shall take steps to provide nonacademic and extracurricular services and activities in the manner necessary to afford children with disabilities an equal opportunity for participation in those services and activities.

Nonacademic and extracurricular services and activities may include counseling services, athletics, transportation, health services, recreational activities, special interest groups or clubs sponsored by the school, referrals to agencies that provide assistance to individuals with disabilities, and employment of students, including both employment by the public agency (school system) and assistance in making outside employment available.

6. 34 C.F.R. 300.42 Supplementary aids and services

Supplementary aids and services means aids, services, and other supports that are provided in the regular education classes, other education-related settings, and in extracurricular and nonacademic settings, to enable children with disabilities to be educated with nondisabled children to the maximum extent appropriate in accordance with 300.114 through 300.116.

II. Case Law

A. Federal Case Law Establishing A Right to Education for Students with Disabilities

1. *Brown v. Board of Education*, 347 U.S. 483 (1954)

The concept of universal education was recognized in 1954. The Supreme Court ruled that separate education is not equal education.

2. *Board of Education v. Rowley*, 458 U.S. 176 (1982)

Supreme Court addressed meaning of FAPE:

A “basic floor of opportunity” which is “access to specialized instruction and related services which are individually designed to benefit the handicapped child.” 458 U.S. 176, 201 (1982)

3. *P.A.R.C. v. Pennsylvania*, 334 F. Supp. 1257 (E.D. Pa. 1971); 343 F. Supp. 279 (E.D. Pa. 1972)

A class action suit filed on behalf of 14 children with mental retardation. The issue before the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania was the constitutionality of statutes and practices that denied access to public education to children with mental retardation. The parents of these children and their advocates who brought this case

argued that Pennsylvania statutes violated the Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. The U.S. District Court agreed with the parents' allegations and entered an order enjoining Pennsylvania from applying any statute that would postpone, deny access, or terminate a free, appropriate public education to any child with mental retardation.

The consent decree also included important LRE language that sets forth the underlying preference for the P.L. 94-142 and the IDEA.

[A] presumption that, among alternative programs of education and training required by the statute to be available, placement in a regular school class is preferable to placement in a special school class... *Id.* at 1260.

4. *Mills v. Board of Education*, 348 F. Supp. 866 (D.D.C. 1972)

The second right to education case followed the PARC case. This case was filed on behalf of seven school-aged children with disabilities seeking an injunction restraining the Board of Education of the District of Columbia from denying them access to public education.

The Court stated that no child should be excluded from public school on the basis of any D.C. Policy or rule unless the child is offered an alternative educational program suited to meet his or her needs. Further, the Court ruled that each child was entitled to a free appropriate public education regardless of the degree of disability.

B. Seminal Federal Court Decisions Related to LRE

1. *Roncker v. Walter*, 700 F.2d 1058 (6th Cir. 1983), *cert. denied*, 464 U.S. 864

This is the first case in which a federal court interpreted the LRE provisions of the Act. The parents of the student wanted their child with a disability to continue to attend his neighborhood school. The school district argued that the student had not succeeded at the neighborhood school, and needed special services that were available at the segregated county school. The Court of Appeals found that the question that must be addressed was whether the student “could have been provided with additional services, such as those provided at the county schools, which would have improved his performance” at the neighborhood school. *Id.* at 1063.

The Court concluded that if the services required feasibly could have been provided in a non-segregated setting, placement in the segregated school

would be inappropriate. This case established the “portability” doctrine, which is the concrete expression of the separation of special education services and the setting in which they are delivered.

2. *Daniel R.R. v. State Bd. of Educ.*, 874 F.2d 1036 (5th Cir. 1989)

The district proposed to remove a kindergarten student with mental retardation from his half-day kindergarten class, and place him in a segregated classroom. Although the Court ultimately found for the school district, it enunciated a test for determining whether a recommended educational placement met the LRE requirements of the Act.

The Court posed the question “whether education in the regular classroom, with the use of supplementary aids and services, can be achieved satisfactorily for a given child. If it cannot and the school intends to provide special education or to remove the child from regular education, we ask, second, whether the school has mainstreamed the child to the maximum extent appropriate.” In order to apply the test, the Court used three factors to analyze the educational placement:

- whether the school system has made attempts to accommodate the student in regular education and if it has, whether its efforts were sufficient;
- whether the student can receive some academic or non-academic benefit from placement in the regular education environment; and
- whether there are negative or adverse effects to either the student with a disability or to typical classmates.

3. *Barnett v. Fairfax County School Bd.*, 721 F. Supp. 757 (E.D. Va. 1989), *aff’d* 927 F.2d 847 (4th Cir. 1991)

A Fairfax County case brought on behalf of a student who was hearing impaired and required the services of a cued speech interpreter. This case was one in which the high school student wanted to access his neighborhood school and requested that the services of a cued speech interpreter be added to the high school. There was another high school in the area where there was a cued speech program.

The Fourth Circuit determined that the Act did not require a school district to replicate each specialized service at neighborhood schools, particularly those services or programs that serve students with low-incidence disabilities.

4. *Oberti v. Bd. of Ed. of Clementon School District*, 995 F.2d 1204 (3rd Cir. 1993)

This case involved an eight-year old student with Down Syndrome, whose parents wanted him fully included in a regular education classroom. The school district recommended a segregated classroom.

The Third Circuit found that the school district failed to prove that the student was incapable of being included in a regular education environment. The school district had failed to consider the whole range of supplementary aids and services that might have facilitated placement in a regular education classroom.

The Court applied the Daniel R.R. test and ordered the school district to provide the student with a “supplementary teacher’s aide to a regular classroom...if necessary, to accommodate the special needs of included students with disabilities.” [Id.]

5. *Sacramento City Unified Dist. v. Rachel H.*, 14 F.3d 1398 (9th Cir. 1994).

This case involved a student with developmental disabilities whose parents wanted her included in a third grade classroom. The school district refused based upon its argument that if allowed to segregate this student, the State Education Agency would give the district more money. In essence the school district would lose money if it allowed Rachel to be included in regular education.

The Court of Appeals found the school system’s argument unpersuasive and affirmed the lower court’s finding that the school system had exaggerated the cost to educate Rachel.

6. *L.B. v. Nebo School District*, 379 F.3d 966 (10th Cir. 2004)

Special education preschool was not the least restrictive environment for a student with autism because she was succeeding in a private mainstream classroom with assistance of her aide and at-home applied behavioral analysis program.

7. *Deal v. Hamilton County*, 392 F.3d 840 (6th Cir. 2004)

The Court held that a regular education teacher of the child needed to be present at the IEP meetings in order to ensure procedural and therefore, substantive, due process compliance with the IDEA protections. The Court said:

“The rationale for requiring the attendance of a regular education teacher is closely tied to Congress’s ‘least restrictive environment’ mandate. The input provided by a regular education teacher is vitally important in considering the extent to which a disabled student may be integrated into a

regular education classroom and how the student's individual needs might be met in that classroom. One of Deal's main objections to the 1999-2000 IEP developed for Zachary is that it did not provide for sufficient integration. The absence of the unique perspective that could have been provided by a regular education teacher therefore had a real impact on the decision-making process." *Id.* at 860.

Appendix D. Summary of Community Input

ACADEMICS/ APPROPRIATE SERVICES

My # 1 Concern

IEP being implemented; Placing children in appropriate classrooms; Example: mixing MLP Fragile and MIP Conduct
Getting my son a good education; Goals are being met
Resources for Life Skills program
The quality education for all Metro school age kids regardless of their disability; Teachers/ principals providing information to help parents
Transition meetings should occur whenever the child moves to another school!
More one-on-one with students
Provision of additional options/flexibility for gifted children
Preparing youth for college prep in special ed earlier than senior year
Curriculum materials for special ed resource students; We specifically need an intervention math curriculum; Intervention materials for elementary designed to help kids fill in the gaps and return to general ed!
Support teachers & students from administration/ feds/ central office
The length of time from initial testing to program intervention
If my child no longer qualifies for speech the OT service will be taken away; He will need OT services longer than speech
E.A.s with highest level of Title I schools; E.A.s being phased out at middle school & under paid
There are no services for my child who has a learning disability
I would like my son's needs met ...right now. I really don't see progress.
Lack of transparency with MNPS district level operations
Sufficient staffing- more therapists, more aides, more integrated classes with aides
Regular education diploma for special education students
Smaller class size
Summer programs; my son had a summer program when he was in elementary; For a single parent, summer is very hard
More academic programs for children with disabilities in the summer
Where are all the programs that will help my child & how do I get in touch with them?
My child falling through the cracks and pushed through without progress

1 of Top 3 Concerns

Giving children work on their level to advance them
Music, Art, Life Skills
Classroom size; How many? Why TCAPs for elementary MIP conduct?
Kids being "labeled" by teachers causing the child a disadvantage; to be given a second chance and try to get help from a teacher
Communication - all teachers involved with the education of a child should know about their special needs
Time management - meetings take so much time away from instruction; Clerical tasks take so much time & energy from planning interesting & engaging lessons; And parent communication
Educational choices are limited in Metro; Life Skills and CBIP are not appropriate for every child
Support Relationships; Funding
Lack of computers that are right for our children - Only access when the behavior is good; Lack of physical activity; Lack of music participation
Adequate intervention or making the time for the classes recommended by IEPs
Communication; Lack of preparedness when meeting with a therapist
Pay for E.A.!
Getting my son where he needs to be; Everyone working together; Get with a program and work hard at it so the goal will be met
Lack of training for teachers and paraprofessionals in modifying for specific disability areas
Not enough support for schools from district level resources
Training all MNPS personnel (special ed practices, inclusion, tolerance)
Summer therapy - if no progress, should receive therapy; rather than with regression only receiving extended therapy
Lack of concern for special ed students by the administration at my child's middle school
Pay and train our assistants adequately
Students with disabilities are not receiving the general ed curriculum, and so are not learning what they should by law

Here's My Idea

Make sure all books come with a CD or tapes
More assistants for children and teachers; More support from principals with special ed programs
Providing mentors in the schools to help with long term goals (positive behavior)
More parent participation; Vision testing before entering MIP; Hearing tested before entering MIP; Other test that are needed
Inclusion facilitators instead of special ed teachers; With discipline programs & in school suspension staffed rooms
Provide intervention materials for resource teachers; Provide vocational curriculum for these students where they can be successful
Allow the professionals/ interested participants be a very important part of decisions in special ed
Each kid learns differently so we need to come up with a program that is going to work for the student
Allow local school leaders to decide program choices
Each classroom needs at least 1 teacher's aide; Special ed classrooms may need 2 or more aides
Coordinate initiatives with MTSU Dyslexia & Vanderbilt Kennedy Ctr students for C.E.U.'s or credits for assistance (one-on-one)
A social interaction "class" for children with Autism and regular ed peers; New Jersey schools have had success with this type of interaction
More public/private interaction; Just imagine a Pencil Foundation serving students with disabilities
If the special ed children can go to school out of their zone; Sometimes the programs for the student could be out of the student's zoning area; Training programs for special ed students

I'm Really Happy With

The potential of RTI
Having programs; Life Skills
The blended pre-k program; Why can't we have blended kindergarten?
Working in the MIP program
My E.A. is wonderful, as are all ed-assistants at my school
Dedicated staff at certain schools
Any success story
The possibility of a better quality of education being taught not memorized
The focus & discussion on special ed in our community
Genuinely dedicated & well trained personnel
The regular ed Math teacher recognized my child's aptitude for Math & presented him with challenging above grade level Math & had a high expectation of achievement
Certain schools
Being a special education teacher

COMMUNITY RESOURCES/ TRANSITION**My # 1 Concern**

Community resources
My daughter's future after she finishes high school at 21; How can I connect her with Vocational Rehabilitation?
Resources are not made available; e.g. Encore, Excel was not available at the school my child attended
Adequate transition planning for community based services
Resources-Dyslexia assistance; Identification of strengths & weaknesses has been used; Not using the information given
My son working in big group in class is difficult for paying attention; He is ok in small group which is better for him

1 of Top 3 Concerns

Finding another option besides meds; Having someone from the outside to assist with children with disabilities
Many teachers are becoming frustrated and disillusioned about the systematic administrative problems within the Metro school system. This is causing a morale issue.
Big group in each class is difficult working each child "not pay attention easy"; Getting more exercise in math, social studies and language each child; Working small group in class

**Here's My
Idea**

More activities in the community for special needs children that are school related and funded
Finding technology grants and/or partners to provide up-to-date visual equipment & software
Focus on all available funding opportunities (such as Grants)
Start in a Vocational Rehab Program and focus on a particular strength instead of struggle with 12 + 13 =
In class uses flat card; working language the same stay drama; working child more for vision that writing for better for learn
Partner with best buddies that is currently being created so that Metro schools will be top of the list to get buddies

**I'm Really
Happy
With**

The community discussions that Mayor Dean is having about various public education issues
The assessment done by MTSU
New administration coming in; Winds of change blowing; Mayor Dean listening; New board members and superintendent
The efforts to hear from the community & parental concerns and to address and create solutions

DISCIPLINE

**My # 1
Concern**

I'm a Metro school bus driver, we have no way to discipline children on the bus because the officials of school will not help us
Discipline (having other ways beside restraints)
Transition to vocation and independent living
There is a difference between a child who because of disabilities acts in socially inappropriate ways and a child who acts violently toward others. The two should not be combined or the former will develop characteristics of the latter.

**1 of Top 3
Concerns**

Vocation training; Independent living skills; Earlier emphasis on transition from academic to vocation
Kids who have learning disabilities, who also have behavioral problems, disrupting the classroom for learning

**Here's My
Idea**

An IEP manager "enforcer"; A coordinator of transitioning from school to work

**I'm Really
Happy
With**

Genesis learning center

INCLUSION/ TEACHER TRAINING

**My # 1
Concern**

On-going, effective professional development & support for teachers
Mainstream out of MIP Conduct
Inclusion and involvement with typical peers
There is not a classroom size limit in MIP; Determining whether a student qualifying for MIP is "fragile" or "conduct"
Positive environment where all children are "included"
General ed teachers need to be trained to educate and include special needs children in the general ed classroom for successful inclusion
Support from administrative staff for students
How the transition of special ed student(s) to a general ed core will effect the dynamic of prior relationships built with that special ed teacher
How do we lower the special ed caseloads? Is inclusion even a possibility with the # of special ed kids in Metro?
Lack of inclusion practices in MNPS
Regular ed teachers who refuse to follow an IEP of a student with a disability assigned to the regular ed program (Refusal to implement accommodations)
K-4 Special ed teachers need to be trained in reading recovery so they can be more effective
Training for E.A.s in special ed classes - all training days have been eliminated; Last year E.A.s were "off payroll" 14 days - the one training offered was hard because subs are so scarce system wide; E.A.s need time to 1) work with their teacher on curriculum development (individual) 2) training for lifting 3) behavioral plans 4) restraint 5) CPR, data taking 6) education for working with special syndrome disabilities - abilities etc and much more

The amount of students I am required to teach in K-4 resource without an assistant (only resource teacher with in the school); This past year 38, last year 41

Special ed teachers & regular ed teachers need access to more support staff and more support services

Inclusion - is it a top priority and will all principals be required to participate?

Inclusion - prepare our students for the real world by integrating them (with supports) into the real world classroom

How budget cutbacks and state intervention will affect funding of services for students with learning differences

Inclusion - My son be starting highschool part time this fall, but there's really no plan on how to support this transition-no peer buddies, teacher accommodations etc.; It's "dump and hope"; We need to make inclusive services a reality for all students with disabilities, meaning a true support system for them to succeed!

MNPS is not organized for the "inclusion" model; Teachers & aides are not trained in inclusion and there is no parallel curriculum

Train us, Pay us, Respect us

Teachers not having standard goals, i.e. peer tutors, inclusion; consistency with what works for the child

1 of Top 3 Concerns

Effective inclusion through research-based collaboration methods

Goals need to be met on (IEP); More training for teachers; Teachers giving their ALL to the kids (not just a paycheck)

Providing our children with "highly qualified" E.A.s

MIP program - students are learning bad behaviors from others; Inclusion must be enforced & schools need to be staffed for this

Training for teachers/ administrators (including best practices, sensitivity, awareness)

Teacher burn-out from overload and under pay

Inclusion; Training; Funding of programs/ Salary of Teachers

Not enough student teacher interaction to make an impression; Severe behavioral students in which LD and MR children; E.A. taken away from resource teacher (1 teacher in building of 670 students)

Segregating students with disabilities from general student population rarely raises the achievement/conduct of students with special needs

Aides are not properly trained, nor given work time to get trained

Training; Class size; Salaries for old special ed teachers

If a special ed student is very good at reading or computer, a peer buddy or an assistant, who will take the student a regular class that the student is showing strength at; All the teachers should have training on special ed whether special ed teacher or not; Some principals - all they do is back up the teacher

Special ed appears to be lowest on list of priorities for budget, training, etc.

Inclusion and steady progress to keep his goals and my opportunity to help in his learning days

Here's My Idea

Provide all resource teachers with training in reading recovery

More training for the special ed teachers & aids to focus on these kid's needs, because each kid learns differently so you all need to come up with a plan for each student

Solicit the many schools in the area for E.A.s and provide them college credit

All teachers get more training for kids with learning disabilities, i.e. kids from broken homes, drugs, alcohol, etc in the home

To have all staff coming together to help special needs children to have better programs to fit each individual's needs

More training/ professional development; Teacher asst.; Reduce class size; More teachers

Classroom teachers need training on how to adapt to a special needs child.\

Develop a training institute for E.A.s free to them, with significant pay incentives

Dissolve self contained classes; Open up learning centers; Increase methodology training; Make inclusion possible!

Scrutinize the MNPS spending; I think there is indirect over spending that could be directed to student education

Follow Mr. Remus's plan of inclusion for every student

Mandatory training for every teacher and administrator on disability sensitivity training; how to include students with disabilities in the regular curriculum; IDEIA rights of students and parents

We need more funding, training, teacher appropriate classrooms, socialization skills

Hire another resource teacher to cut the # of students per teacher; Our school has 670 + students with 1 resource teacher and no E.A.!

Hire a superintendent from an inclusive friendly school system; Make sure they have a special ed priority/ concern/ awareness/ knowledge

MNPS should create one model "inclusion" school and use it to train other school personnel
 Same ideas should follow students through school- elementary, middle, high school; Inclusion & peer tutors are examples
 Get a grant - writing committee together to get a cutting edge inclusion program in Metro

**I'm Really
Happy
With**

Nothing with Life Skills
 MIP Conduct; teachers that take their time with the students; Also they don't focus on the negatives, they mainly focus on the positive
 To see students go to another level, for example: going into general ed setting from MIP programs
 The school adjusting to my son's needs
 My school's principal (she should train principals on creating an inclusive atmosphere)
 Inclusion at certain schools works well with most, @50% to 60% of regular ed teachers- Life Skills teacher sends appropriate work along with student; Also peer helpers in their class help them with projects - AR tests and computer research
 My principal and assistant principals help with any of my concerns
 The welcoming/ encouraging/ understanding staff at my son's elementary school
 The care, nurturing and support my son has received at his school; Why can't these qualities & supports be transferred to an inclusive setting?
 My son's aide - but that's because I pay to have her trained privately!

PARENTAL VOICE

**My # 1
Concern**

Make sure parents receive the right information concerning their child needs; info not given to parent on how their child can get help

**1 of Top 3
Concerns**

Future for my MIP fragile child; Following IEP programs; My child getting lost in the system - MIP programs do not have a graduation rate
 Support from general ed teachers; Support from peers within the special ed department; Parental support
 Length paper work to complete for students who need an S-team completed; Why does it take so long to get a student tested for special resources; Additional help & assistant for teachers who teach in an inclusive curriculum - example. social studies
 Getting lost and not heard; Missing opportunities for improvement
 Educate my child; Communicate with me; Help me help you; Educate me on the different things I need to know

**Here's My
Idea**

Special needs support groups in every school
 To make available teaching tools that can be reinforced at home
 Greater encouragement of parental involvement - significant parental involvement
 Have a training program for parents
 Communicate with parents about things that they can do; Talk to us, work with us; Hear our voices along with our children's voice
 Allow volunteers' input and help enable what teachers, parents, and students need aides to ease paper load; Allow teachers to be successful in class

**I'm Really
Happy
With**

The middle school he attends
 The support I receive from my principal and assistant principal
 I honestly can say that I'm not happy with anything right now about Special ed in Davidson County
 Feedback of issues or problems with special ed
 You trying to make things better; it does give you hope that maybe things might get better

TRANSPORTATION/ SAFETY

My # 1 Concern

Special ed children not being ready when you go to pick them up
Parents not at home when they get out of school; We have to go back two or three times
Transportation of students in wheelchairs (multiple disabilities & medically fragile)

1 of Top 3 Concerns

We are more of a baby sitter than a bus driver
Some kids on the bus too long; Some bus drivers have one school and some bus drivers have 4 schools to go to; Kids are not ready in the morning when we get there
Not a bus aide for some buses
The complete lack of focus of individual student needs in the area of transportation
No special ed buses; children need to be on regular buses

Here's My Idea

When a child is sick make the parents come and get the child from school, not to wait on the bus that afternoon and put the child on the bus and make everyone on the bus sick
Find out and assign E.A.s and other assistants; general & library assistants already in system to bus monitor positions;
Why add more people to payroll- use persons already in system who are already being covered re. payroll taxes, retirement and health insurance
Hire Michael Remus, and transform Metro schools!; Another idea- instead of spending money to ship special ed students in special buses all over the place put them on regular buses to their school of zone; Make sure every student with a disability has peer buddies on the bus. This would be safer!; Use all the money you've saved to help provide inclusive services in the schools

I'm Really Happy With

My daughter's school and her bus driver really looks out for her
Bus drivers- all that she has had through the years

Appendix E. Supplementary Aids and Services

From the Maryland Coalition for Inclusive Education <http://www.mcie.org/>

Environmental/physical accommodations/modifications

- Providing preferential seating
- Altering physical arrangement of classroom
- Reducing distractions
- Providing quiet corner/room
- Modifying equipment
- Adapting writing utensils
- Allowing use of study carrel
- Providing assistance in maintaining uncluttered space
- Providing space for movement or breaks

Instructional modifications

- Teaching to learning style
- Modifying materials
- Providing resource room instruction
- Providing one to one instruction
- Varying method of instruction
- Varying content of lesson
- Providing alternative assignments
- Providing extra visual and verbal cues and prompts
- Providing study sheets
- Conducting as assistive technology evaluation
- Providing augmentative communication devices
- Allowing use of computer and calculator
- Allowing use of tape recorder
- Providing books on tape
- Providing textbooks for at home use
- Providing note taker or teacher outlines, study guides
- Modifying workload or length of assignments/tests
- Modifying time demands
- Allowing additional time for assignments and tests
- Allowing answers to be dictated
- Providing word bank
- Providing hands-on activities
- Providing highlighted materials
- Allowing use of manipulatives
- Giving no penalty for spelling errors, sloppy handwriting

- Providing adapted physical education
- Following routine or schedule
- Alternate quiet and active time
- Teach management skills
- Assign specific tasks within specific time period

Social/behavioral interventions/supports

- Providing immediate feedback
- Allowing rest breaks
- Conducting functional behavioral analysis
- Implementing behavioral intervention strategies
- Implementing behavior modification plan
- Developing crisis intervention plan
- Using varied reinforcement system
- Providing circle of friends
- Provide peer buddies
- Provide counseling
- Providing verbal and visual cues regarding transition
- Providing verbal and visual cues regarding directions or staying on task
- Providing study skills instruction
- Providing management skills instruction
- Providing agenda book
- Providing visual daily schedule
- Adjusting assignment timelines
- Providing checklists
- Giving notice, warning before change in activities
- Allowing daily check-in with case manager or special education teacher

Staff supports/collaboration

- Enhanced staffing
- Providing one on one aide
- Instituting Co-teaching arrangement
- Designating adult staff member to listen and provide support
- Providing small group instruction
- Using cooperative learning groups
- Providing staff development

Testing Accommodations

- Allowing answers to be dictated
- Allowing frequent rest breaks
- Allowing additional time

- Allowing oral testing
- Giving no timed tests
- Giving choice of test (multiple-choice, essay, true-false)
- Accepting short answers
- Allowing open book or open note tests
- Shortening test
- Reading test to student
- Providing study guide prior to test
- Highlighting key directions
- Giving test in alternative site
- Allowing calculator, word processor

Appendix F. Student Time in General and Special Education

Count of Primary Disability			
Primary Disability	Percent in SPED	Percent in GE	Total
01-Mild Retardation	0.94%	99.06%	1
	1.09%	98.91%	1
	2.14%	97.86%	1
	2.86%	97.14%	1
	5.71%	94.29%	1
	7.14%	92.86%	1
	8.57%	91.43%	1
	10.46%	89.54%	1
	14.29%	85.71%	75
	15.71%	84.29%	1
	17.14%	82.86%	1
	21.43%	78.57%	2
	28.57%	71.43%	8
	29.03%	70.97%	1
	30.00%	70.00%	1
	30.71%	69.29%	1
	31.43%	68.57%	2
	31.63%	68.37%	1
	32.09%	67.91%	1
	34.29%	65.71%	1
	35.71%	64.29%	4
	36.43%	63.57%	1
	39.29%	60.71%	1
	40.00%	60.00%	1
	42.00%	58.00%	1
	42.86%	57.14%	29
	43.51%	56.49%	1
	45.71%	54.29%	3
	46.66%	53.34%	1
	47.20%	52.80%	1
	48.80%	51.20%	1
	50.00%	50.00%	1
	57.14%	42.86%	15
	57.80%	42.20%	1
	60.00%	40.00%	1
	60.66%	39.34%	1
	61.43%	38.57%	1
	62.14%	37.86%	1
	62.97%	37.03%	1
	63.57%	36.43%	1
	64.29%	35.71%	5
	65.23%	34.77%	1
	65.71%	34.29%	2
	68.57%	31.43%	5

71.43%	28.57%	22
71.51%	28.49%	1
72.09%	27.91%	1
72.86%	27.14%	4
73.57%	26.43%	1
73.86%	26.14%	1
74.14%	25.86%	1
74.17%	25.83%	1
74.29%	25.71%	2
74.31%	25.69%	1
74.40%	25.60%	1
75.00%	25.00%	1
75.29%	24.71%	1
75.66%	24.34%	1
75.71%	24.29%	1
76.43%	23.57%	1
77.14%	22.86%	1
77.86%	22.14%	1
78.34%	21.66%	1
78.37%	21.63%	1
78.57%	21.43%	3
78.60%	21.40%	1
81.43%	18.57%	1
81.49%	18.51%	1
82.86%	17.14%	1
84.80%	15.20%	1
85.00%	15.00%	1
85.57%	14.43%	1
85.60%	14.40%	1
85.66%	14.34%	1
85.71%	14.29%	69
85.74%	14.26%	2
85.80%	14.20%	1
86.06%	13.94%	1
86.20%	13.80%	2
86.26%	13.74%	1
86.34%	13.66%	1
86.46%	13.54%	1
86.54%	13.46%	1
87.14%	12.86%	7
87.34%	12.66%	1
87.49%	12.51%	1
87.80%	12.20%	1
88.51%	11.49%	1
88.57%	11.43%	17
88.91%	11.09%	2
89.57%	10.43%	1
89.89%	10.11%	1

	90.00%	10.00%	1
	91.43%	8.57%	1
	92.09%	7.91%	1
	92.86%	7.14%	1
	93.20%	6.80%	1
	98.26%	1.74%	1
	98.80%	1.20%	1
	98.97%	1.03%	1
	99.23%	0.77%	1
	99.86%	0.14%	1
	100.00%	0.00%	138
01-Mild Retardation Total			499
02-Moderate Retardation	14.29%	85.71%	29
	35.71%	64.29%	1
	42.86%	57.14%	1
	51.69%	48.31%	1
	57.14%	42.86%	1
	60.06%	39.94%	1
	65.71%	34.29%	1
	68.57%	31.43%	1
	71.43%	28.57%	5
	71.77%	28.23%	2
	73.89%	26.11%	1
	74.29%	25.71%	1
	74.63%	25.37%	1
	75.00%	25.00%	1
	78.57%	21.43%	3
	81.43%	18.57%	1
	82.74%	17.26%	1
	84.29%	15.71%	1
	85.31%	14.69%	1
	85.66%	14.34%	1
	85.71%	14.29%	21
	85.80%	14.20%	2
	85.89%	14.11%	2
	86.31%	13.69%	1
	87.03%	12.97%	1
	87.14%	12.86%	5
	87.23%	12.77%	1
	87.49%	12.51%	1
	87.51%	12.49%	1
	88.57%	11.43%	4
	88.63%	11.37%	2
	89.06%	10.94%	1
	89.23%	10.77%	1
	89.89%	10.11%	1
	90.00%	10.00%	1
	90.03%	9.97%	1

	90.80%	9.20%	1
	92.51%	7.49%	1
	98.86%	1.14%	2
	99.29%	0.71%	1
	99.31%	0.69%	1
	99.43%	0.57%	1
	99.69%	0.31%	1
	99.71%	0.29%	1
	99.77%	0.23%	3
	99.86%	0.14%	2
	99.94%	0.06%	2
	100.00%	0.00%	82
02-Moderate Retardation Total			199
03-Profound Retardation	8.77%	91.23%	1
	9.89%	90.11%	1
	14.29%	85.71%	1
	64.20%	35.80%	1
	80.00%	20.00%	1
	85.71%	14.29%	1
	98.71%	1.29%	1
	99.03%	0.97%	1
	99.06%	0.94%	1
	99.26%	0.74%	2
	99.40%	0.60%	1
	99.69%	0.31%	1
	99.71%	0.29%	1
	99.74%	0.26%	1
	99.80%	0.20%	2
	99.83%	0.17%	1
	99.89%	0.11%	1
	99.91%	0.09%	1
	99.94%	0.06%	1
	100.00%	0.00%	10
03-Profound Retardation Total			31
04-Speech Impairment	0.03%	99.97%	4
	0.06%	99.94%	3
	0.09%	99.91%	4
	0.14%	99.86%	9
	0.20%	99.80%	3
	0.31%	99.69%	21
	0.34%	99.66%	1
	0.43%	99.57%	6
	0.54%	99.46%	1
	0.66%	99.34%	14
	0.71%	99.29%	6
	0.89%	99.11%	1
	0.91%	99.09%	1
	0.94%	99.06%	1

1.31%	98.69%	2
1.43%	98.57%	114
1.46%	98.54%	1
1.51%	98.49%	1
1.57%	98.43%	2
1.66%	98.34%	1
1.69%	98.31%	1
1.74%	98.26%	5
1.97%	98.03%	4
2.09%	97.91%	2
2.11%	97.89%	1
2.14%	97.86%	8
2.31%	97.69%	1
2.37%	97.63%	2
2.40%	97.60%	1
2.54%	97.46%	1
2.60%	97.40%	1
2.86%	97.14%	399
2.89%	97.11%	1
3.00%	97.00%	2
3.06%	96.94%	1
3.17%	96.83%	5
3.31%	96.69%	3
3.40%	96.60%	1
3.51%	96.49%	1
3.57%	96.43%	1
3.80%	96.20%	2
4.03%	95.97%	1
4.17%	95.83%	2
4.29%	95.71%	35
4.43%	95.57%	1
4.71%	95.29%	1
5.00%	95.00%	1
5.23%	94.77%	1
5.71%	94.29%	18
6.14%	93.86%	1
6.43%	93.57%	1
6.71%	93.29%	1
7.46%	92.54%	1
8.11%	91.89%	1
8.57%	91.43%	16
8.71%	91.29%	1
8.83%	91.17%	1
9.23%	90.77%	1
9.43%	90.57%	2
10.00%	90.00%	3
10.66%	89.34%	1
11.43%	88.57%	2

	13.09%	86.91%	1
	13.57%	86.43%	1
	14.29%	85.71%	75
	14.43%	85.57%	1
	14.60%	85.40%	1
	14.83%	85.17%	1
	15.26%	84.74%	1
	15.71%	84.29%	4
	17.14%	82.86%	5
	17.80%	82.20%	1
	18.57%	81.43%	1
	20.00%	80.00%	1
	24.29%	75.71%	5
	24.71%	75.29%	1
	25.71%	74.29%	2
	28.57%	71.43%	2
	31.43%	68.57%	3
	32.14%	67.86%	1
	32.86%	67.14%	1
	35.43%	64.57%	1
	37.86%	62.14%	1
	38.57%	61.43%	1
	38.89%	61.11%	1
	42.86%	57.14%	2
	44.29%	55.71%	2
	45.71%	54.29%	2
	47.14%	52.86%	1
	50.71%	49.29%	1
	54.29%	45.71%	1
	57.14%	42.86%	1
	60.00%	40.00%	1
	88.57%	11.43%	1
	100.00%	0.00%	2
04-Speech Impairment Total			857
05-Language Impairment	0.06%	99.94%	1
	0.09%	99.91%	3
	0.14%	99.86%	5
	0.17%	99.83%	1
	0.20%	99.80%	3
	0.26%	99.74%	1
	0.31%	99.69%	12
	0.49%	99.51%	1
	0.54%	99.46%	1
	0.63%	99.37%	1
	0.66%	99.34%	6
	0.71%	99.29%	8
	0.94%	99.06%	1
	1.03%	98.97%	1

1.17%	98.83%	1
1.26%	98.74%	1
1.37%	98.63%	1
1.43%	98.57%	33
1.51%	98.49%	1
1.97%	98.03%	2
2.00%	98.00%	1
2.09%	97.91%	2
2.14%	97.86%	4
2.37%	97.63%	2
2.86%	97.14%	137
2.94%	97.06%	2
3.00%	97.00%	2
3.03%	96.97%	1
3.17%	96.83%	1
3.31%	96.69%	1
3.34%	96.66%	1
3.51%	96.49%	4
3.57%	96.43%	3
3.80%	96.20%	2
4.29%	95.71%	9
4.31%	95.69%	1
4.37%	95.63%	1
4.49%	95.51%	2
4.60%	95.40%	1
4.74%	95.26%	1
4.97%	95.03%	1
5.00%	95.00%	3
5.23%	94.77%	1
5.71%	94.29%	17
6.03%	93.97%	1
6.17%	93.83%	1
6.71%	93.29%	1
7.14%	92.86%	7
7.29%	92.71%	1
7.46%	92.54%	1
8.31%	91.69%	1
8.57%	91.43%	20
8.63%	91.37%	1
8.77%	91.23%	1
8.89%	91.11%	1
9.29%	90.71%	1
10.00%	90.00%	17
11.43%	88.57%	4
11.89%	88.11%	2
12.69%	87.31%	1
12.86%	87.14%	4
13.09%	86.91%	1

13.57%	86.43%	7
14.29%	85.71%	122
14.31%	85.69%	2
14.34%	85.66%	2
14.43%	85.57%	6
14.49%	85.51%	4
14.60%	85.40%	3
14.74%	85.26%	2
15.00%	85.00%	1
15.03%	84.97%	1
15.23%	84.77%	1
15.26%	84.74%	1
15.71%	84.29%	11
15.91%	84.09%	1
15.94%	84.06%	1
15.97%	84.03%	1
16.00%	84.00%	2
16.26%	83.74%	1
17.14%	82.86%	60
17.46%	82.54%	1
17.80%	82.20%	1
17.86%	82.14%	1
18.11%	81.89%	2
18.57%	81.43%	7
18.86%	81.14%	1
19.03%	80.97%	1
19.29%	80.71%	2
20.00%	80.00%	4
20.71%	79.29%	5
21.43%	78.57%	8
21.57%	78.43%	2
21.74%	78.26%	1
22.14%	77.86%	2
22.37%	77.63%	2
22.57%	77.43%	1
22.86%	77.14%	5
22.89%	77.11%	1
23.80%	76.20%	2
24.29%	75.71%	28
24.37%	75.63%	1
24.71%	75.29%	1
25.43%	74.57%	1
25.57%	74.43%	1
25.71%	74.29%	7
26.17%	73.83%	3
26.43%	73.57%	1
26.66%	73.34%	1
26.83%	73.17%	1

27.14%	72.86%	2
27.60%	72.40%	1
27.86%	72.14%	1
28.57%	71.43%	41
28.63%	71.37%	1
28.66%	71.34%	1
28.71%	71.29%	3
28.77%	71.23%	1
28.89%	71.11%	3
29.00%	71.00%	1
29.03%	70.97%	5
29.11%	70.89%	1
29.26%	70.74%	1
29.29%	70.71%	1
30.00%	70.00%	13
30.14%	69.86%	1
30.31%	69.69%	1
30.46%	69.54%	1
30.71%	69.29%	1
31.43%	68.57%	70
31.74%	68.26%	1
32.60%	67.40%	1
32.74%	67.26%	1
32.86%	67.14%	4
35.23%	64.77%	1
35.71%	64.29%	2
35.89%	64.11%	1
37.14%	62.86%	5
38.03%	61.97%	1
38.57%	61.43%	9
38.89%	61.11%	1
39.29%	60.71%	3
39.37%	60.63%	1
39.46%	60.54%	1
39.60%	60.40%	1
40.00%	60.00%	3
42.86%	57.14%	65
42.91%	57.09%	1
42.94%	57.06%	1
43.03%	56.97%	2
43.06%	56.94%	2
43.17%	56.83%	5
43.29%	56.71%	1
43.46%	56.54%	1
43.57%	56.43%	1
44.29%	55.71%	17
44.71%	55.29%	1
44.94%	55.06%	1

45.00%	55.00%	1
45.71%	54.29%	29
45.77%	54.23%	1
46.43%	53.57%	1
47.14%	52.86%	1
48.57%	51.43%	3
50.00%	50.00%	1
51.43%	48.57%	1
52.86%	47.14%	2
53.80%	46.20%	1
53.83%	46.17%	1
55.94%	44.06%	1
57.14%	42.86%	15
57.80%	42.20%	1
58.09%	41.91%	1
58.57%	41.43%	3
59.06%	40.94%	1
59.77%	40.23%	1
60.00%	40.00%	6
60.17%	39.83%	1
60.31%	39.69%	2
60.66%	39.34%	1
61.43%	38.57%	1
62.86%	37.14%	1
63.83%	36.17%	1
64.29%	35.71%	3
64.60%	35.40%	1
64.94%	35.06%	1
65.49%	34.51%	1
67.14%	32.86%	1
68.57%	31.43%	2
69.23%	30.77%	1
71.43%	28.57%	10
71.51%	28.49%	1
71.77%	28.23%	1
72.86%	27.14%	4
73.57%	26.43%	1
74.29%	25.71%	3
76.06%	23.94%	1
80.00%	20.00%	1
81.43%	18.57%	1
85.71%	14.29%	12
85.89%	14.11%	1
86.06%	13.94%	1
87.14%	12.86%	1
87.63%	12.37%	1
88.57%	11.43%	10
89.06%	10.94%	1

	90.00%	10.00%	1
	90.49%	9.51%	1
	91.43%	8.57%	2
	94.29%	5.71%	1
	94.57%	5.43%	1
	97.34%	2.66%	1
	98.57%	1.43%	1
	99.29%	0.71%	1
	100.00%	0.00%	36
05-Language Impairment Total			1140
06-Deafness	14.29%	85.71%	4
	71.43%	28.57%	1
	85.71%	14.29%	4
	86.06%	13.94%	1
	88.91%	11.09%	3
	97.14%	2.86%	1
	100.00%	0.00%	10
06-Deafness Total			24
07-Hearing Impaired	0.14%	99.86%	2
	0.31%	99.69%	5
	0.66%	99.34%	6
	0.71%	99.29%	1
	1.03%	98.97%	1
	1.43%	98.57%	14
	1.57%	98.43%	1
	1.86%	98.14%	1
	1.91%	98.09%	1
	2.09%	97.91%	1
	2.14%	97.86%	3
	2.86%	97.14%	8
	3.00%	97.00%	1
	4.29%	95.71%	10
	4.37%	95.63%	2
	4.60%	95.40%	2
	5.00%	95.00%	1
	5.71%	94.29%	5
	6.43%	93.57%	1
	7.09%	92.91%	1
	7.14%	92.86%	1
	10.71%	89.29%	1
	11.37%	88.63%	1
	11.43%	88.57%	1
	14.29%	85.71%	7
	18.29%	81.71%	1
	19.23%	80.77%	1
	24.60%	75.40%	1
	25.71%	74.29%	1
	28.89%	71.11%	1

	29.29%	70.71%	1
	42.86%	57.14%	1
	44.29%	55.71%	1
	47.14%	52.86%	1
	48.89%	51.11%	1
	50.31%	49.69%	1
	73.20%	26.80%	1
	80.00%	20.00%	1
	80.66%	19.34%	1
	82.86%	17.14%	1
	85.71%	14.29%	3
	88.57%	11.43%	2
	89.63%	10.37%	1
	91.43%	8.57%	1
	94.29%	5.71%	1
	100.00%	0.00%	7
07-Hearing Impaired Total			108
08-Blind	0.97%	99.03%	1
	2.86%	97.14%	1
	2.89%	97.11%	1
	4.29%	95.71%	1
	4.69%	95.31%	1
	8.57%	91.43%	1
	10.09%	89.91%	1
	11.43%	88.57%	1
	15.97%	84.03%	1
	19.69%	80.31%	1
	20.00%	80.00%	2
	30.66%	69.34%	1
	30.80%	69.20%	1
	32.03%	67.97%	1
	38.34%	61.66%	1
	38.57%	61.43%	1
	40.54%	59.46%	1
	46.14%	53.86%	1
	53.29%	46.71%	1
	55.91%	44.09%	1
	58.60%	41.40%	1
	67.14%	32.86%	1
	67.69%	32.31%	1
	85.34%	14.66%	1
	85.71%	14.29%	1
	100.00%	0.00%	1
08-Blind Total			27
09-Visual Impairment	0.14%	99.86%	2
	0.31%	99.69%	1
	0.66%	99.34%	1
	0.97%	99.03%	1

	1.46%	98.54%	1
	1.63%	98.37%	1
	2.14%	97.86%	1
	2.86%	97.14%	1
	3.00%	97.00%	1
	3.17%	96.83%	2
	3.57%	96.43%	1
	5.71%	94.29%	1
	7.14%	92.86%	1
	7.86%	92.14%	1
	10.97%	89.03%	1
	14.29%	85.71%	2
	15.71%	84.29%	1
	15.77%	84.23%	1
	21.00%	79.00%	1
	22.86%	77.14%	1
	28.09%	71.91%	1
	29.29%	70.71%	1
	49.77%	50.23%	1
	60.31%	39.69%	1
	81.43%	18.57%	1
	86.17%	13.83%	1
	87.31%	12.69%	1
	87.89%	12.11%	1
09-Visual Impairment Total			31
10-Orthopedic/Physical Impairment	0.60%	99.40%	1
	0.66%	99.34%	1
	0.71%	99.29%	1
	0.86%	99.14%	1
	1.06%	98.94%	1
	1.20%	98.80%	1
	1.43%	98.57%	1
	1.57%	98.43%	1
	1.66%	98.34%	1
	1.89%	98.11%	1
	2.74%	97.26%	1
	9.03%	90.97%	1
	14.29%	85.71%	8
	16.66%	83.34%	1
	28.57%	71.43%	1
	42.86%	57.14%	2
	42.94%	57.06%	1
	43.03%	56.97%	1
	43.40%	56.60%	1
	43.51%	56.49%	1
	44.86%	55.14%	1
	45.83%	54.17%	1
	46.03%	53.97%	1

	60.97%	39.03%	1
	64.34%	35.66%	1
	64.54%	35.46%	1
	71.43%	28.57%	2
	85.71%	14.29%	1
	86.37%	13.63%	1
	87.14%	12.86%	2
	87.34%	12.66%	1
	90.06%	9.94%	1
	92.14%	7.86%	1
	92.91%	7.09%	1
	99.49%	0.51%	1
	99.69%	0.31%	1
	99.80%	0.20%	1
	100.00%	0.00%	15
10-Orthopedic/Physical Impairment Total			62
11-Other Health Impairment	0.03%	99.97%	2
	0.06%	99.94%	1
	0.09%	99.91%	3
	0.14%	99.86%	1
	0.20%	99.80%	1
	0.23%	99.77%	1
	0.31%	99.69%	4
	0.37%	99.63%	1
	0.40%	99.60%	1
	0.66%	99.34%	2
	0.69%	99.31%	1
	0.71%	99.29%	5
	1.17%	98.83%	2
	1.43%	98.57%	6
	2.37%	97.63%	2
	2.86%	97.14%	1
	3.57%	96.43%	6
	4.29%	95.71%	1
	4.31%	95.69%	1
	4.66%	95.34%	1
	5.00%	95.00%	1
	7.14%	92.86%	1
	8.57%	91.43%	2
	9.03%	90.97%	1
	9.86%	90.14%	1
	9.94%	90.06%	1
	11.43%	88.57%	2
	13.94%	86.06%	1
	14.29%	85.71%	46
	14.43%	85.57%	1
	14.94%	85.06%	2
	15.26%	84.74%	1

	15.71%	84.29%	1
	15.80%	84.20%	1
	17.14%	82.86%	1
	17.86%	82.14%	4
	18.43%	81.57%	1
	21.43%	78.57%	7
	22.86%	77.14%	2
	24.29%	75.71%	1
	28.57%	71.43%	10
	29.03%	70.97%	2
	29.29%	70.71%	1
	32.60%	67.40%	1
	34.74%	65.26%	1
	35.71%	64.29%	2
	39.29%	60.71%	3
	42.86%	57.14%	24
	44.29%	55.71%	1
	51.57%	48.43%	1
	52.14%	47.86%	1
	57.14%	42.86%	8
	65.49%	34.51%	1
	71.43%	28.57%	2
	72.09%	27.91%	1
	75.23%	24.77%	1
	77.14%	22.86%	1
	78.57%	21.43%	1
	82.14%	17.86%	1
	85.37%	14.63%	1
	85.71%	14.29%	10
	88.57%	11.43%	2
	88.80%	11.20%	1
	94.29%	5.71%	1
	95.77%	4.23%	1
	99.86%	0.14%	1
	100.00%	0.00%	40
11-Other Health Impairment Total			241
12-Traumatic Brain Injury	0.31%	99.69%	2
	0.46%	99.54%	1
	1.63%	98.37%	1
	2.86%	97.14%	1
	14.29%	85.71%	6
	18.57%	81.43%	1
	28.57%	71.43%	1
	28.89%	71.11%	1
	42.86%	57.14%	2
	43.11%	56.89%	1
	85.71%	14.29%	1
	94.29%	5.71%	1

	99.71%	0.29%	1
	99.86%	0.14%	1
	100.00%	0.00%	6
12-Traumatic Brain Injury Total			27
13-Specific Learning Disability	0.03%	99.97%	3
	0.06%	99.94%	2
	0.09%	99.91%	21
	0.11%	99.89%	1
	0.14%	99.86%	18
	0.20%	99.80%	10
	0.31%	99.69%	23
	0.37%	99.63%	1
	0.43%	99.57%	2
	0.46%	99.54%	16
	0.54%	99.46%	1
	0.66%	99.34%	8
	0.71%	99.29%	55
	0.74%	99.26%	2
	0.94%	99.06%	5
	0.97%	99.03%	1
	1.03%	98.97%	1
	1.17%	98.83%	3
	1.31%	98.69%	1
	1.43%	98.57%	33
	1.57%	98.43%	1
	1.89%	98.11%	4
	2.11%	97.89%	1
	2.37%	97.63%	10
	2.63%	97.37%	1
	2.71%	97.29%	1
	2.86%	97.14%	30
	2.94%	97.06%	1
	3.00%	97.00%	1
	3.09%	96.91%	1
	3.17%	96.83%	1
	3.57%	96.43%	3
	3.80%	96.20%	1
	3.86%	96.14%	1
	4.03%	95.97%	1
	4.29%	95.71%	5
	4.74%	95.26%	2
	5.23%	94.77%	1
	5.46%	94.54%	1
	5.71%	94.29%	5
	5.94%	94.06%	1
	6.03%	93.97%	1
	6.43%	93.57%	1
	7.14%	92.86%	16

7.60%	92.40%	1
7.86%	92.14%	2
8.57%	91.43%	10
9.23%	90.77%	1
9.29%	90.71%	1
10.71%	89.29%	20
11.43%	88.57%	6
11.46%	88.54%	1
11.89%	88.11%	9
12.37%	87.63%	2
12.86%	87.14%	3
13.09%	86.91%	6
13.14%	86.86%	1
13.20%	86.80%	1
13.31%	86.69%	1
13.40%	86.60%	2
14.29%	85.71%	468
14.43%	85.57%	1
14.49%	85.51%	1
14.60%	85.40%	2
14.74%	85.26%	3
14.91%	85.09%	1
14.94%	85.06%	1
15.00%	85.00%	2
15.34%	84.66%	1
15.46%	84.54%	1
15.71%	84.29%	4
16.26%	83.74%	1
16.43%	83.57%	3
16.66%	83.34%	2
17.14%	82.86%	25
17.80%	82.20%	1
17.86%	82.14%	18
17.94%	82.06%	1
19.03%	80.97%	2
19.29%	80.71%	1
19.51%	80.49%	1
19.71%	80.29%	2
20.00%	80.00%	1
20.71%	79.29%	2
21.43%	78.57%	67
21.46%	78.54%	1
21.49%	78.51%	1
21.51%	78.49%	1
21.74%	78.26%	1
21.86%	78.14%	1
22.14%	77.86%	2
22.57%	77.43%	1

22.86%	77.14%	7
23.17%	76.83%	1
23.80%	76.20%	10
24.29%	75.71%	7
25.00%	75.00%	2
25.71%	74.29%	7
26.17%	73.83%	12
26.66%	73.34%	1
26.89%	73.11%	3
27.69%	72.31%	1
28.57%	71.43%	298
28.66%	71.34%	1
28.71%	71.29%	1
28.89%	71.11%	2
29.23%	70.77%	4
29.29%	70.71%	1
29.49%	70.51%	1
29.54%	70.46%	2
30.00%	70.00%	7
30.71%	69.29%	1
31.43%	68.57%	23
31.54%	68.46%	1
32.60%	67.40%	1
32.86%	67.14%	3
34.29%	65.71%	15
35.71%	64.29%	40
35.80%	64.20%	1
36.69%	63.31%	1
37.14%	62.86%	8
38.09%	61.91%	1
38.57%	61.43%	3
38.63%	61.37%	1
38.89%	61.11%	1
39.29%	60.71%	8
40.00%	60.00%	3
40.71%	59.29%	1
42.86%	57.14%	379
42.89%	57.11%	1
43.06%	56.94%	1
43.17%	56.83%	5
43.29%	56.71%	1
43.31%	56.69%	2
43.57%	56.43%	1
44.29%	55.71%	12
44.94%	55.06%	1
45.00%	55.00%	2
45.23%	54.77%	1
45.71%	54.29%	15

	46.43%	53.57%	1
	46.66%	53.34%	1
	47.14%	52.86%	2
	47.86%	52.14%	1
	48.57%	51.43%	2
	48.97%	51.03%	1
	50.00%	50.00%	6
	51.43%	48.57%	2
	52.37%	47.63%	3
	54.14%	45.86%	2
	55.71%	44.29%	3
	56.49%	43.51%	1
	57.14%	42.86%	86
	57.31%	42.69%	1
	57.86%	42.14%	1
	58.57%	41.43%	1
	60.00%	40.00%	3
	62.57%	37.43%	1
	62.86%	37.14%	1
	63.51%	36.49%	1
	64.29%	35.71%	32
	65.71%	34.29%	1
	68.57%	31.43%	1
	69.77%	30.23%	1
	71.43%	28.57%	76
	71.60%	28.40%	1
	71.77%	28.23%	1
	72.09%	27.91%	1
	72.86%	27.14%	6
	74.29%	25.71%	2
	77.14%	22.86%	1
	78.57%	21.43%	6
	78.80%	21.20%	1
	80.00%	20.00%	2
	81.43%	18.57%	1
	85.71%	14.29%	37
	85.83%	14.17%	1
	86.06%	13.94%	1
	87.14%	12.86%	1
	88.57%	11.43%	1
	89.23%	10.77%	1
	91.43%	8.57%	2
	92.86%	7.14%	1
	98.57%	1.43%	1
	99.86%	0.14%	1
	99.94%	0.06%	3
	100.00%	0.00%	125
13-Specific Learning Disability Total			2314

14-ADHD	0.09%	99.91%	2
	0.14%	99.86%	4
	0.26%	99.74%	1
	0.31%	99.69%	5
	0.43%	99.57%	2
	0.46%	99.54%	7
	0.51%	99.49%	1
	0.66%	99.34%	1
	0.71%	99.29%	13
	0.74%	99.26%	1
	0.94%	99.06%	3
	1.37%	98.63%	1
	1.43%	98.57%	16
	1.57%	98.43%	2
	2.37%	97.63%	4
	2.60%	97.40%	1
	2.86%	97.14%	4
	3.29%	96.71%	1
	3.57%	96.43%	3
	4.29%	95.71%	1
	4.60%	95.40%	1
	4.74%	95.26%	1
	5.71%	94.29%	4
	7.14%	92.86%	6
	8.57%	91.43%	1
	9.54%	90.46%	1
	10.71%	89.29%	4
	11.17%	88.83%	1
	11.43%	88.57%	3
	11.89%	88.11%	3
	12.14%	87.86%	1
	12.86%	87.14%	1
	13.09%	86.91%	1
	13.14%	86.86%	1
	14.29%	85.71%	97
	14.94%	85.06%	1
	15.00%	85.00%	1
	15.60%	84.40%	1
	15.71%	84.29%	2
	16.74%	83.26%	1
	16.89%	83.11%	1
	17.14%	82.86%	5
	17.86%	82.14%	2
	18.31%	81.69%	1
	18.57%	81.43%	1
	21.43%	78.57%	11
	22.86%	77.14%	5
	23.80%	76.20%	2

24.29%	75.71%	1
25.00%	75.00%	2
25.71%	74.29%	1
26.17%	73.83%	2
27.14%	72.86%	1
28.57%	71.43%	57
28.71%	71.29%	1
28.89%	71.11%	2
29.54%	70.46%	1
30.00%	70.00%	2
31.20%	68.80%	1
31.43%	68.57%	5
34.29%	65.71%	2
35.71%	64.29%	1
36.03%	63.97%	1
38.09%	61.91%	1
38.57%	61.43%	1
39.29%	60.71%	1
39.94%	60.06%	1
40.00%	60.00%	1
41.43%	58.57%	1
42.86%	57.14%	54
42.97%	57.03%	1
43.31%	56.69%	1
44.29%	55.71%	2
44.94%	55.06%	1
45.14%	54.86%	1
46.37%	53.63%	1
46.74%	53.26%	1
47.14%	52.86%	1
50.00%	50.00%	1
51.43%	48.57%	1
52.37%	47.63%	1
57.14%	42.86%	15
58.57%	41.43%	1
60.00%	40.00%	1
62.57%	37.43%	1
64.29%	35.71%	7
67.14%	32.86%	1
71.43%	28.57%	16
72.86%	27.14%	1
74.29%	25.71%	2
75.71%	24.29%	1
76.20%	23.80%	1
77.14%	22.86%	1
78.57%	21.43%	1
85.71%	14.29%	23
86.20%	13.80%	1

	86.37%	13.63%	1
	86.66%	13.34%	1
	87.14%	12.86%	2
	89.57%	10.43%	1
	92.86%	7.14%	1
	99.94%	0.06%	5
	100.00%	0.00%	92
14-ADHD Total			561
15-Emotional Disturbance	0.03%	99.97%	1
	0.09%	99.91%	1
	0.14%	99.86%	1
	0.20%	99.80%	2
	0.31%	99.69%	8
	0.46%	99.54%	2
	0.49%	99.51%	1
	0.71%	99.29%	13
	0.94%	99.06%	1
	1.43%	98.57%	6
	1.57%	98.43%	1
	1.74%	98.26%	1
	2.14%	97.86%	1
	2.37%	97.63%	2
	2.86%	97.14%	4
	3.00%	97.00%	1
	3.57%	96.43%	1
	4.29%	95.71%	1
	5.71%	94.29%	1
	7.14%	92.86%	4
	10.71%	89.29%	2
	11.17%	88.83%	1
	11.43%	88.57%	1
	12.86%	87.14%	1
	13.09%	86.91%	1
	14.29%	85.71%	125
	14.60%	85.40%	1
	15.06%	84.94%	1
	15.23%	84.77%	1
	15.71%	84.29%	3
	16.66%	83.34%	1
	17.86%	82.14%	1
	21.43%	78.57%	4
	21.74%	78.26%	1
	26.17%	73.83%	1
	28.57%	71.43%	19
	29.03%	70.97%	1
	31.43%	68.57%	4
	39.29%	60.71%	1
	42.86%	57.14%	32

	43.57%	56.43%	1
	44.29%	55.71%	3
	45.71%	54.29%	2
	46.43%	53.57%	1
	47.63%	52.37%	1
	50.00%	50.00%	1
	51.91%	48.09%	1
	54.29%	45.71%	1
	57.14%	42.86%	20
	57.46%	42.54%	1
	57.63%	42.37%	1
	58.57%	41.43%	2
	62.57%	37.43%	1
	64.29%	35.71%	5
	64.46%	35.54%	1
	68.57%	31.43%	1
	70.00%	30.00%	1
	71.43%	28.57%	24
	72.14%	27.86%	2
	72.86%	27.14%	2
	72.89%	27.11%	1
	73.03%	26.97%	1
	74.29%	25.71%	1
	75.00%	25.00%	1
	83.34%	16.66%	1
	85.71%	14.29%	35
	89.89%	10.11%	1
	94.29%	5.71%	1
	96.37%	3.63%	1
	96.43%	3.57%	1
	98.60%	1.40%	1
	99.03%	0.97%	1
	99.83%	0.17%	1
	99.94%	0.06%	11
	100.00%	0.00%	169
15-Emotional Disturbance Total			554
16-Functional Delay	0.71%	99.29%	2
	2.86%	97.14%	1
	4.74%	95.26%	1
	6.43%	93.57%	1
	10.00%	90.00%	1
	12.86%	87.14%	1
	14.29%	85.71%	49
	17.14%	82.86%	1
	17.57%	82.43%	1
	17.86%	82.14%	1
	19.71%	80.29%	1
	21.43%	78.57%	2

22.14%	77.86%	1
24.29%	75.71%	1
25.00%	75.00%	1
25.71%	74.29%	1
26.17%	73.83%	3
28.57%	71.43%	22
28.89%	71.11%	1
29.11%	70.89%	1
29.23%	70.77%	2
30.00%	70.00%	2
30.97%	69.03%	1
31.43%	68.57%	7
32.86%	67.14%	1
34.29%	65.71%	1
35.71%	64.29%	5
38.57%	61.43%	1
39.29%	60.71%	3
39.46%	60.54%	1
40.00%	60.00%	2
42.86%	57.14%	49
43.29%	56.71%	1
43.51%	56.49%	1
44.29%	55.71%	5
45.71%	54.29%	8
46.03%	53.97%	1
47.14%	52.86%	1
48.57%	51.43%	1
57.14%	42.86%	19
57.57%	42.43%	1
58.57%	41.43%	1
60.00%	40.00%	1
64.29%	35.71%	4
68.57%	31.43%	1
71.43%	28.57%	20
71.77%	28.23%	1
71.83%	28.17%	1
72.09%	27.91%	1
72.86%	27.14%	1
74.29%	25.71%	3
77.14%	22.86%	1
78.00%	22.00%	1
78.57%	21.43%	4
78.91%	21.09%	1
81.43%	18.57%	1
81.77%	18.23%	1
85.71%	14.29%	26
85.74%	14.26%	1
85.80%	14.20%	1

	85.89%	14.11%	1
	86.06%	13.94%	1
	87.14%	12.86%	1
	87.23%	12.77%	1
	87.49%	12.51%	1
	88.57%	11.43%	5
	89.06%	10.94%	1
	91.43%	8.57%	1
	98.57%	1.43%	2
	99.94%	0.06%	1
	100.00%	0.00%	47
16-Functional Delay Total			339
17-Multiple Disabilities	8.71%	91.29%	1
	10.03%	89.97%	1
	14.29%	85.71%	6
	85.00%	15.00%	1
	88.57%	11.43%	1
	99.71%	0.29%	1
	100.00%	0.00%	8
17-Multiple Disabilities Total			19
18-Intellectually Gifted	0.03%	99.97%	3
	0.06%	99.94%	1
	0.09%	99.91%	5
	0.14%	99.86%	5
	0.20%	99.80%	1
	0.31%	99.69%	6
	0.43%	99.57%	2
	0.46%	99.54%	6
	0.66%	99.34%	2
	0.71%	99.29%	5
	0.94%	99.06%	4
	1.43%	98.57%	1
	1.89%	98.11%	2
	2.03%	97.97%	1
	2.14%	97.86%	4
	2.86%	97.14%	21
	3.17%	96.83%	2
	4.74%	95.26%	1
	5.71%	94.29%	1
	8.57%	91.43%	1
	10.86%	89.14%	1
	14.29%	85.71%	15
	50.00%	50.00%	1
	100.00%	0.00%	1
18-Intellectually Gifted Total			92
20-Developmental Delay	0.06%	99.94%	1
	0.14%	99.86%	2
	0.31%	99.69%	2

0.54%	99.46%	1
0.80%	99.20%	1
0.97%	99.03%	1
1.43%	98.57%	1
2.14%	97.86%	2
2.29%	97.71%	1
2.37%	97.63%	1
2.86%	97.14%	12
3.06%	96.94%	1
3.17%	96.83%	2
3.51%	96.49%	1
3.66%	96.34%	1
4.17%	95.83%	2
4.23%	95.77%	1
4.29%	95.71%	3
4.43%	95.57%	1
5.00%	95.00%	2
5.14%	94.86%	1
5.71%	94.29%	4
5.86%	94.14%	2
5.97%	94.03%	1
6.43%	93.57%	1
6.60%	93.40%	1
6.66%	93.34%	1
7.14%	92.86%	4
8.57%	91.43%	1
8.80%	91.20%	1
9.89%	90.11%	1
10.00%	90.00%	6
10.71%	89.29%	1
10.86%	89.14%	1
10.97%	89.03%	1
11.03%	88.97%	1
11.43%	88.57%	5
11.89%	88.11%	1
12.09%	87.91%	1
12.23%	87.77%	1
12.37%	87.63%	1
12.83%	87.17%	1
12.86%	87.14%	3
13.51%	86.49%	1
13.57%	86.43%	1
14.29%	85.71%	48
15.00%	85.00%	3
15.09%	84.91%	1
15.23%	84.77%	1
15.46%	84.54%	1
15.60%	84.40%	1

15.71%	84.29%	5
16.00%	84.00%	1
16.17%	83.83%	1
16.69%	83.31%	1
17.14%	82.86%	27
17.29%	82.71%	1
17.34%	82.66%	1
17.46%	82.54%	1
17.69%	82.31%	1
17.80%	82.20%	1
17.86%	82.14%	1
18.11%	81.89%	2
18.46%	81.54%	1
18.57%	81.43%	4
18.83%	81.17%	1
19.71%	80.29%	1
20.00%	80.00%	2
20.66%	79.34%	1
20.71%	79.29%	1
21.43%	78.57%	2
22.86%	77.14%	6
22.97%	77.03%	1
23.80%	76.20%	1
24.29%	75.71%	6
25.09%	74.91%	1
25.43%	74.57%	1
25.71%	74.29%	3
26.43%	73.57%	1
27.14%	72.86%	1
28.57%	71.43%	13
28.66%	71.34%	1
28.89%	71.11%	1
29.23%	70.77%	1
29.29%	70.71%	1
29.54%	70.46%	2
30.00%	70.00%	2
31.43%	68.57%	18
31.60%	68.40%	1
31.97%	68.03%	1
32.40%	67.60%	4
32.60%	67.40%	1
32.86%	67.14%	4
33.51%	66.49%	1
33.83%	66.17%	1
34.03%	65.97%	1
34.29%	65.71%	2
35.71%	64.29%	1
37.14%	62.86%	4

38.57%	61.43%	5
39.23%	60.77%	1
41.49%	58.51%	1
42.74%	57.26%	1
42.86%	57.14%	2
43.06%	56.94%	1
43.51%	56.49%	1
44.29%	55.71%	1
44.94%	55.06%	1
45.71%	54.29%	4
46.37%	53.63%	1
47.14%	52.86%	5
51.43%	48.57%	1
57.14%	42.86%	2
57.46%	42.54%	1
58.11%	41.89%	1
59.23%	40.77%	1
60.00%	40.00%	1
60.97%	39.03%	1
61.43%	38.57%	4
62.09%	37.91%	1
68.57%	31.43%	1
71.43%	28.57%	1
72.09%	27.91%	1
74.29%	25.71%	6
75.29%	24.71%	1
77.14%	22.86%	1
77.80%	22.20%	1
78.57%	21.43%	1
79.23%	20.77%	1
80.00%	20.00%	1
81.43%	18.57%	1
82.86%	17.14%	2
83.51%	16.49%	2
84.17%	15.83%	1
84.29%	15.71%	3
84.80%	15.20%	1
85.00%	15.00%	2
85.23%	14.77%	1
85.46%	14.54%	1
85.71%	14.29%	12
85.77%	14.23%	1
86.20%	13.80%	5
86.77%	13.23%	1
87.03%	12.97%	1
87.14%	12.86%	6
87.37%	12.63%	1
88.14%	11.86%	1

	88.57%	11.43%	14
	88.91%	11.09%	2
	89.23%	10.77%	1
	89.29%	10.71%	2
	89.40%	10.60%	1
	89.57%	10.43%	1
	89.89%	10.11%	2
	90.00%	10.00%	6
	90.83%	9.17%	1
	91.00%	9.00%	1
	91.14%	8.86%	1
	91.43%	8.57%	5
	91.60%	8.40%	1
	92.74%	7.26%	2
	92.86%	7.14%	1
	93.51%	6.49%	1
	94.17%	5.83%	1
	94.29%	5.71%	2
	94.77%	5.23%	1
	95.71%	4.29%	2
	96.43%	3.57%	1
	97.14%	2.86%	2
	97.80%	2.20%	1
	98.57%	1.43%	1
	99.29%	0.71%	1
	99.74%	0.26%	1
	100.00%	0.00%	96
20-Developmental Delay Total			519
22-Autism (and other Autism Spectrum Disorders)	0.09%	99.91%	2
	0.20%	99.80%	1
	0.23%	99.77%	1
	0.31%	99.69%	1
	0.46%	99.54%	2
	0.49%	99.51%	2
	0.66%	99.34%	1
	0.71%	99.29%	4
	0.94%	99.06%	1
	1.09%	98.91%	1
	1.14%	98.86%	1
	1.31%	98.69%	1
	1.43%	98.57%	1
	1.66%	98.34%	1
	1.97%	98.03%	1
	2.14%	97.86%	2
	2.46%	97.54%	1
	2.86%	97.14%	2
	2.89%	97.11%	1
	2.91%	97.09%	1

2.94%	97.06%	1
3.00%	97.00%	2
3.17%	96.83%	1
3.31%	96.69%	1
3.57%	96.43%	1
3.80%	96.20%	2
4.29%	95.71%	2
4.31%	95.69%	1
4.74%	95.26%	1
5.00%	95.00%	1
5.71%	94.29%	2
6.69%	93.31%	1
7.14%	92.86%	1
8.57%	91.43%	2
10.00%	90.00%	2
10.71%	89.29%	1
11.49%	88.51%	1
14.29%	85.71%	50
14.60%	85.40%	1
14.94%	85.06%	3
15.00%	85.00%	2
15.26%	84.74%	1
15.71%	84.29%	4
16.17%	83.83%	1
16.37%	83.63%	1
17.23%	82.77%	2
18.17%	81.83%	1
18.57%	81.43%	1
18.97%	81.03%	1
19.94%	80.06%	1
23.57%	76.43%	1
23.80%	76.20%	1
24.29%	75.71%	1
25.71%	74.29%	2
27.60%	72.40%	1
28.57%	71.43%	7
28.89%	71.11%	1
30.00%	70.00%	2
30.31%	69.69%	1
31.43%	68.57%	3
32.86%	67.14%	1
36.69%	63.31%	1
38.57%	61.43%	1
41.43%	58.57%	1
42.86%	57.14%	5
42.97%	57.03%	1
45.71%	54.29%	1
46.69%	53.31%	1

47.14%	52.86%	1
50.00%	50.00%	1
51.43%	48.57%	1
54.17%	45.83%	1
56.86%	43.14%	1
57.14%	42.86%	5
57.37%	42.63%	1
57.46%	42.54%	1
58.40%	41.60%	1
58.57%	41.43%	1
58.89%	41.11%	1
60.66%	39.34%	1
60.97%	39.03%	1
61.74%	38.26%	1
62.14%	37.86%	1
62.86%	37.14%	1
63.09%	36.91%	1
65.26%	34.74%	1
66.20%	33.80%	1
67.31%	32.69%	1
70.71%	29.29%	1
71.43%	28.57%	10
72.09%	27.91%	1
72.86%	27.14%	2
73.57%	26.43%	1
74.29%	25.71%	1
75.71%	24.29%	2
77.31%	22.69%	1
77.74%	22.26%	1
78.57%	21.43%	3
80.00%	20.00%	2
81.43%	18.57%	1
84.80%	15.20%	1
85.71%	14.29%	12
85.94%	14.06%	1
86.06%	13.94%	1
86.20%	13.80%	1
87.14%	12.86%	12
87.37%	12.63%	1
87.49%	12.51%	1
87.80%	12.20%	1
87.86%	12.14%	1
88.03%	11.97%	2
88.09%	11.91%	1
88.46%	11.54%	1
88.51%	11.49%	1
88.57%	11.43%	13
88.66%	11.34%	1

	88.74%	11.26%	1
	88.91%	11.09%	2
	88.97%	11.03%	1
	89.23%	10.77%	4
	89.57%	10.43%	1
	89.77%	10.23%	1
	89.89%	10.11%	7
	90.00%	10.00%	7
	91.31%	8.69%	1
	91.43%	8.57%	1
	92.49%	7.51%	1
	92.54%	7.46%	1
	92.86%	7.14%	1
	94.63%	5.37%	1
	95.00%	5.00%	1
	95.71%	4.29%	1
	96.71%	3.29%	1
	96.91%	3.09%	1
	97.09%	2.91%	1
	97.14%	2.86%	3
	98.71%	1.29%	1
	98.74%	1.26%	1
	99.06%	0.94%	1
	99.29%	0.71%	1
	99.57%	0.43%	1
	99.89%	0.11%	1
	99.94%	0.06%	1
	100.00%	0.00%	139
22-Autism (and other Autism Spectrum Disorders) Total			437
23-Severe Retardation	14.29%	85.71%	10
	22.14%	77.86%	1
	28.57%	71.43%	1
	49.77%	50.23%	1
	85.71%	14.29%	1
	88.34%	11.66%	1
	92.57%	7.43%	1
	95.91%	4.09%	1
	97.54%	2.46%	1
	98.06%	1.94%	1
	98.26%	1.74%	1
	98.94%	1.06%	2
	99.11%	0.89%	1
	99.17%	0.83%	1
	99.31%	0.69%	2
	99.54%	0.46%	1
	99.57%	0.43%	1
	99.69%	0.31%	1
	99.71%	0.29%	1

	99.77%	0.23%	6
	99.80%	0.20%	5
	99.83%	0.17%	2
	99.86%	0.14%	1
	99.89%	0.11%	1
	99.91%	0.09%	1
	99.94%	0.06%	2
	99.97%	0.03%	1
	100.00%	0.00%	32
23-Severe Retardation Total			81
Grand Total			8162